

On Many-Body Localization for Quantum Spin Chains

John Z. Imbrie*

Department of Mathematics, University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4137, USA
imbrie@virginia.edu

April 1, 2014

Abstract

A one-dimensional spin chain with random local interactions exhibits many-body localization. The proof depends on a physically reasonable assumption that limits the amount of level attraction in the system. The construction uses a sequence of local unitary transformations to diagonalize the Hamiltonian and connect the exact many-body eigenfunctions to the original basis vectors.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Background	2
1.2	Results	4
1.3	Methods	6
2	First Step	7
2.1	Resonant Blocks	7
2.2	Effective Hamiltonian	7
2.3	Small Block Diagonalization	9
2.4	Expectations of Observables	11
3	The Second Step	12
3.1	Resonant Blocks	12
3.2	Perturbation in the Nonresonant Couplings	16
3.3	Small Block Diagonalization	18

*Currently at the School of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

4	The General Step	19
4.1	Starting point for the k^{th} step	19
4.2	Resonant Blocks	20
4.2.1	Graphical Sums	22
4.2.2	The Jacobian	25
4.2.3	Resonant Graphs	30
4.2.4	Block Probabilities	34
4.3	Perturbation Step and Proof of Inductive Bounds	36
4.4	Diagonalization and Conclusion of Proof	40
4.5	Infinite Volume Limit and Local State-Labeling Operators	42
5	Level Statistics	43

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The eigenfunctions of a single-particle Hamiltonian with a large random potential are localized: they decay exponentially with the distance from some center. Does the phenomenon of localization persist in a more realistic model with interacting particles? This question was raised in Anderson's original paper [3], and subsequent work in the physics literature [24, 26, 39, 29, 6, 44, 37] supports the idea of many-body localization, on the basis of several theoretical perspectives and on numerical work.

In this paper we focus on one of the simplest models where many-body localization should occur. We consider the many-body spin chain Hamiltonian on the lattice $\Lambda = [-K, K] \cap \mathbb{Z}$:

$$H = \sum_{i=-K}^K h_i S_i^z + \sum_{i=-K}^K \gamma_i S_i^x + \sum_{i=-K-1}^K J_i S_i^z S_{i+1}^z. \quad (1.1)$$

This operates on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathbb{C}^2$, with

$$S_i^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, S_i^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.2)$$

operating on the i^{th} variable. Variables outside of Λ are frozen (projected out), *i.e.* we set $S_i^z = 1$ in (1.1) for $i \notin \Lambda$ for + boundary conditions. Note that H is diagonal in the basis used above, except for the second term involving S_i^x . We write $\gamma_i = \gamma \Gamma_i$ with γ small, and assume h_i , Γ_i , and J_i are independent, bounded random variables with probability densities bounded by a fixed constant ρ_0 .

This model is a variant of the model studied in [37]; it should have a transition from a many-body-localized phase for small γ or J to a thermalized phase if γ and J are

large. (Note that a tensor product basis of eigenstates can easily be constructed for H if either γ or J is zero.) We investigate properties of general eigenstates, not just those at low energies.

The notion of localization has to be adapted to the many-body context, for a couple of reasons. First, the configuration space includes the positions of all the particles (or the values of all the spins). Decay in this space is too much to ask for. Second, whatever basis we choose for $\mathcal{H}$, interactions connect a given state to nearby states everywhere in space. This means that a normalized eigenfunction will lose its amplitude exponentially with the volume. This phenomenon is related to the orthogonality catastrophe of [4].

We will examine three signs of many-body localization. First, for the above Hamiltonian, the basis vectors are tensor products of $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$ in each index. We have weak off-diagonal disorder, and one might expect that the eigenfunctions resemble basis vectors, which would imply that for most eigenstates, the expectation of S_i^z should be close to $+1$ or -1 . This is a basic signal of many-body localization for H . The analogous statement for the one-body Anderson model is the fact that most eigenfunctions have the preponderance of amplitude near a particular site.

The second sign has to do with the product structure of $\mathcal{H}$. The Hilbert space is a tensor product of local vector spaces (instead of a direct sum, as in the single-body problem). In the absence of interactions, this structure carries over to the eigenstates. With weak interactions, one should see the tensor product structure emerge at long distances: for any eigenstate, correlations between local operators separated by a distance r should decay like $\gamma^{\kappa r}$ for some $\kappa > 0$. This is analogous to the exponential decay of eigenfunctions in the one-body problem, but it is a decay of entanglement, rather than amplitude.

As in the one-body Anderson model, there should be a natural way to create a mapping between eigenstates and basis vectors, away from a dilute set of resonant regions. This is a third sign of many-body localization.

The second term of (1.1) is the Laplacian on the hypercube; it implements spin flips or hops between basis vectors differing at a single site in $\mathbb{Z}$. But a key difference between H and the one-body Anderson model is the random potential—here it consists of the first and third terms of (1.1). There is a lack of monotonicity, and in addition the number of random variables is only logarithmic in the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$. This creates particular challenges for rigorous work. The term $\sum_i h_i S_i^z$ is sufficient to break degeneracies associated with individual spin flips. However, we do not have full control over energy differences for configuration changes in extended regions, so an assumption about local eigenvalue statistics is a prerequisite for our results.

Our methods will apply to more general models provided they have a few key properties in common with (1.1). Specifically, there must be a tensor product basis in which the Hamiltonian is a diagonal matrix plus a local perturbation, with all terms having random coefficients. (Models with only some terms random, *e.g.* (1.1) with γ_i , J_i fixed, could be considered as well, but a stronger assumption about the behavior

of eigenvalue differences would be needed.) The dimension of the state space at a site should be finite. The diagonal part should have local interactions (*e.g.* nearest-neighbor as above), and the random variables at each site i should be able to move energy differences between pairs of basis vectors that differ only at i . Thus one may consider certain models of interacting particles in $\mathbb{Z}$ with hard-core conditions.

There is a considerable literature of rigorous work on the phenomenon of single-particle Anderson localization, for example the proof of absence of diffusion in dimensions 2 or more [25] and the proof of exponential localization (exponential decay of the average of a fractional moment of the Green's function [1]). The latter work also applies to Hamiltonians on the Bethe lattice, which is relevant for models of many-body localization involving decay in Fock space along tree-like particle cascades [35, 29, 6]. Like the spin chain, the Bethe lattice exhibits an exponential growth in the number of states as a function of the diameter of the system—this is a key problem for rigorous work on many-body localization. There are results for a fixed number of interacting particles [14, 2, 15, 11, 10, 34, 33, 23]. Recent results on localization in many-body systems include a proof of an asymptotic form of localization (in a non-random system with frustration) [18] and a proof of localization when the disorder strength diverges rapidly with the volume [27].

1.2 Results

We will need to assume a property of limited level attraction for the Hamiltonian in boxes of varying size:

Assumption $\mathbf{LLA}(\nu, c)$. (*Limited level attraction*) Consider the Hamiltonian H in boxes of size n . Its eigenvalues satisfy

$$P\left(\min_{\alpha \neq \beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta| < \delta\right) \leq \delta^\nu c^n, \quad (1.3)$$

for all $\delta > 0$ and all n .

We show that many-body localization holds (in a sense made precise below) for γ small enough, provided $\mathbf{LLA}(\nu, c)$ holds for some fixed ν, c . Ideally, one would like to prove many-body localization without making such an assumption. However, at this point we lack the tools to adequately deal with such questions of level statistics. However, $\mathbf{LLA}(\nu, c)$ is a very mild assumption from the physical point of view, since random matrices normally have either neutral statistics ($\nu = 1$, *e.g.* Poisson) or repulsive ones ($\nu > 1$, *e.g.* GOE). Indeed, the thermalized phase should have significant level repulsion [36]. In fact, we only need (1.3) for a particular value of δ (ε^n for some small ε). This is sufficient to obtain the weaker assumption $\mathbf{A2}(\nu, \varepsilon)$ (see Chapter 5), which is enough to obtain all our results.

For the purposes of this paper, many-body localization (MBL) consists of the following properties of the eigenvalues and eigenstates of H :

- (i) Existence of a labeling system for eigenstates by spin/metaspin configurations, with metaspins needed only on a dilute collection of resonant blocks. (As mentioned above, the spin variables used to label basis vectors can also be used to label the exact eigenstates, but the correspondence becomes somewhat arbitrary in resonant regions, so we use the term “metaspin” instead.)
- (ii) Faster-than-power-law decay of the probability of resonant blocks, which implies their diluteness. (This is critical to the whole concept of a labeling system—without it the labeling system would lose its meaning.)
- (iii) Diagonalization of H via a sequence of local rotations defined via convergent graphical expansions with exponential bounds. (Locality means that graphs depend only on the random variables in their immediate vicinity.)
- (iv) Bounds establishing closeness of expectations of local observables in any eigenstate to their naïve ($\gamma = 0$) values, when observables are not in resonant regions. (This makes precise the idea that eigenstates resemble the basis vectors.)
- (v) Almost sure convergence of local energy differences and expectations of local observables as $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.
- (vi) Exponential decay of truncated expectations, except on a set of rapidly decaying probability. (This shows the exponential loss of entanglement with distance for the subsystems associated with the observables.)
- (vii) Faster-than-power-law decay of averaged truncated expectations.

The set of resonant regions will be constructed through an inductive procedure that generates local rotations to successively diagonalize the Hamiltonian. Further details and concrete bounds will be deferred to the main body of the paper. However, we state here a theorem that incorporates (iv), (vi), and (vii). It can be taken as a basic characterization of many-body localization. We will need a notion of state-averaging. Let α be a label for the eigenstates of H . Then let Av_α denote the average over the 2^n values of α (for a box of size n). The average can be with uniform weights (infinite temperature) or with any energy-dependent weight function with total mass 1, *e.g.* $(\text{const}) \exp(-\beta E_\alpha)$, which gives the usual ensemble for inverse temperature β .

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\mathbf{LLA}(\nu, c)$ for some fixed ν, c . Then there exists a $\kappa > 0$ such that for γ sufficiently small,*

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha |\langle S_0^z \rangle_\alpha| = 1 - O(\gamma^\kappa), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_\alpha$ denotes the expectation in the eigenstate α . Furthermore, for any i, j ,

$$\max_\alpha |\langle \mathcal{O}_i; \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha| \leq \gamma^{|i-j|/3} \text{ with probability } 1 - (\gamma^\kappa)^{1+c_3(\log(|i-j|/8\nu 1))^2}, \quad (1.5)$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$. Here $\langle \mathcal{O}_i; \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha \equiv \langle \mathcal{O}_i \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha - \langle \mathcal{O}_i \rangle_\alpha \langle \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha$, with $\mathcal{O}_i$ any operator formed from products of $S_{i'}^x$ or $S_{i'}^z$, for i' in a fixed neighborhood of i . Finally,

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha |\langle \mathcal{O}_i; \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha| \leq (\gamma^\kappa)^{1+c_3(\log(|i-j|/8\vee 1))^2}. \quad (1.6)$$

All bounds are uniform in Λ .

From (1.4), we can see that with high probability, most states have the property that the expectation of S_0^z is close to $+1$ or -1 , as is the case for the basis vectors. This would contrast with a thermalized phase, wherein states resemble thermal ensembles (a consequence of the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis—see [20, 43, 38]). Assume a symmetric distribution of h_i . Then with thermalization, averages of eigenstate expectations of S_0^z should go to zero as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ [37]. Thus one sign of many-body localization is the violation of thermalization as in (1.4).

Another sign of many-body localization would be the absence of transport. Although we have not looked at time-dependent quantities, essentially all of the eigenstates we have constructed have a nonuniform spatial distribution of energy, and this necessarily persists for all time. So in a very basic sense, there is no transport in the system—this is another feature of the lack of thermalization.

Our rigorous result on many-body localization is an important capstone to the physical arguments that have led to the idea of a many-body localized phase. Without full control of the approximations used, there remains the possibility that thermalization sets in at some very long length scale. Such a scenario would not show up in the numerics, and has been conjectured to occur in the nonrandom model of [18].

1.3 Methods

We will perform a complete diagonalization of the Hamiltonian by successively eliminating low-order off-diagonal terms. The process runs on a sequence of length scales $L_k = (15/8)^k$, and off-diagonal elements of order γ^m , $m \in [L_k, L_{k+1})$ will be eliminated in the k^{th} step. The orthogonal rotations that accomplish this can be written as a convergent power series, provided nonresonant conditions are satisfied. Resonant regions are diagonalized as blocks in quasidegenerate perturbation theory. The crux of the method is control of probabilities of resonances. It will be critical to maintain bounds exponential in the length scale of the resonance. Otherwise, the bounds will be overwhelmed by the exponential number of transitions that need to be tested for resonance. The method was developed in [32] for the single-body Anderson model. This led to a new proof of the exponential localization result of [1] via multi-scale analysis, working directly with rotations, instead of resolvents. The key estimate that allows the procedure to work on all length scales is a uniform decay rate for a fractional moment for graphs with many independent energy denominators. This leads to exponential bounds on resonance probabilities, at least for graphs with mostly independent denominators.

The method can be thought of as a KAM or block Jacobi [42] procedure. Each step is a similarity transformation implementing Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory in a manner very close to that of [16, 17] (though in those works a single transformation was sufficient to break degeneracies in the Hamiltonian).

A number of authors have used related KAM constructions to prove localization for quasiperiodic and deterministic potentials [8, 7, 13, 12, 21, 22]. More broadly, a number of different flows have been used to diagonalize matrices in various contexts [19, 9, 30, 45]. Related renormalization group ideas have appeared in [40, 46, 28, 5].

The idea that local unitary transformations may be used to isolate local variables in a many-body localized system has appeared in [41, 31]. Here, we implement the rotations in a constructive manner, providing explicit expansions for the rotations along with bounds that quantify the notion of locality. Such expansions are new, even in the single-body context [32].

2 First Step

2.1 Resonant Blocks

Resonances occur when transitions induced by off-diagonal matrix elements produce an energy change that is smaller than some cutoff ε . In the spin chain, a transition is a spin flip at a site i . If we start from spin configuration σ , let the flipped spin configuration be $\sigma^{(i)}$:

$$\sigma_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} -\sigma_j, & j = i, \\ \sigma_j, & j \neq i. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Let

$$E(\sigma) = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} h_i \sigma_i + \sum_{(i,i+1) \subset \Lambda} J_i \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \quad (2.2)$$

denote the diagonal entry of H corresponding to σ . (We take $\sigma_i = 1$ for $i \notin \Lambda$.) Then

$$E(\sigma) - E(\sigma^{(i)}) = 2\sigma_i(h_i + J_i\sigma_{i+1} + J_{i-1}\sigma_{i-1}). \quad (2.3)$$

We say that the site i is resonant if $|E(\sigma) - E(\sigma^{(i)})| < \varepsilon$ for any values of $\sigma_{i-1}, \sigma_{i+1}$. The probability that i is resonant is bounded by $4\rho_0\varepsilon$. We take ε small, and assume that $\gamma \leq \varepsilon^{20}$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{i \in \Lambda : i \text{ is resonant}\}$. Then we may decompose $\mathcal{S}_1$ into resonant blocks using nearest-neighbor connections. Clearly, the probability that two sites i, j lie in the same block is bounded by $(4\rho_0\varepsilon)^{|i-j|}$.

2.2 Effective Hamiltonian

Let us group the off-diagonal terms of H as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
J^{(0)} &= \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \gamma_i S_i^x = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} J^{(0)}(i) = J^{(0)\text{per}} + J^{(0)\text{res}} \\
&= \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{S}_1} J^{(0)\text{per}}(i) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} J^{(0)\text{res}}(i),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where $J^{(0)\text{res}}$ contains terms with $i \in \mathcal{S}_1$, and $J^{(0)\text{per}}$ containing terms in the nonresonant region. Then define the antisymmetric basis change generating operator

$$A = \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{S}_1} A(i), \tag{2.5}$$

with the local operator $A(i)$ given by its matrix elements:

$$A(i)_{\sigma\sigma^{(i)}} = \frac{J^{(0)\text{per}}(i)_{\sigma\sigma^{(i)}}}{E(\sigma) - E(\sigma^{(i)})} = \frac{\gamma_i}{E(\sigma) - E(\sigma^{(i)})}. \tag{2.6}$$

All other matrix elements of $A(i)$ are zero; $A(i)$ only connects spin configurations differing by a single flip at i . Nonresonance conditions ensure that all matrix elements of $A(i)$ are bounded by $\gamma/\varepsilon \leq \gamma^{1-\delta}$ with $\delta = \frac{1}{20}$. In fact $\|A(i)\| \leq \gamma/\varepsilon$ since each row/column sum has a single term with that bound. Also, $\|J(i)\| = 1$.

Next, we define the basis change $\Omega = e^{-A}$. Let H_0 be the diagonal part of H . Note that $[A, H_0] = -J^{(0)\text{per}}$, so that $[A, H] = -J^{(0)\text{per}} + [A, J^{(0)}]$, and then

$$\begin{aligned}
H^{(1)} &= e^A H e^{-A} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A)^n}{n!} H \\
&= H_0 + J^{(0)\text{res}} + J^{(0)\text{per}} - J^{(0)\text{per}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A)^{n-1} (-J^{(0)\text{per}}) + (\text{ad} A)^n (J^{(0)\text{per}} + J^{(0)\text{res}})}{n!} \\
&= H_0 + J^{(0)\text{res}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{(n+1)!} (\text{ad} A)^n J^{(0)\text{per}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A)^n}{n!} J^{(0)\text{res}} \\
&= H_0 + J^{(0)\text{res}} + J^{(1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Note that A and $J^{(0)}$ are given by a sum of local operators, so the commutators in $J(i)$ likewise will be given as a sum of local operators (although the range of the operator grows as n , the order of the commutator). However, even though $A(i)$ and $J(i)$ only act on the i^{th} spin component, the matrix elements of $A(i)$ depend on the spins at $i-1$ and $i+1$. Therefore $[A(i), A(j)]$ and $[A(i), J(j)]$ do not in general vanish when $|i-j|=1$. They do vanish when $|i-j| \geq 2$.

We may give graphical expansions for $J^{(1)}$ by expanding each J , A in $(\text{ad} A)^n J^{(0)\text{per}}$ and $(\text{ad} A)^n J^{(0)\text{res}}$ as a sum of operators localized at individual sites.

Thus

$$(\text{ad}A)^n J^{(0)\text{per}} = \sum_{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n} \text{ad}A(i_n) \dots \text{ad}A(i_1) J^{(0)}(i_0). \quad (2.8)$$

We must have $\text{dist}(i_p, \{i_0, \dots, i_{p-1}\}) \leq 1$; otherwise the commutator with $A(i_p)$ vanishes. Note that the number of choices for i_p , given $i_0, \dots, i_{p-1}$, is no greater than $p+2$. Thus we have in effect, a combinatoric factor $(n+2)!/2!$ which is controlled by the prefactors $n/(n+1)!$ or $1/n!$, leaving only a factor $(n+1)(n+2)$. There are 2^n terms from writing out an n^{th} order commutator, so the series is geometrically convergent. We may write

$$J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)} = \sum_{g_1: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)}(g_1), \quad (2.9)$$

where g_1 represents a walk in spin configuration space that is connected in the sense described above. That is, g_1 prescribes an ordered product of operators $A(i_p)$ or $J^{(0)}(i_0)$ arising from the admissible sequence $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$ after expanding the commutators. A similar graphical expansion can be derived when the similarity transformation is applied to any local operator, *e.g.* S_0^z or S_0^x . Nonresonant conditions imply the operator norm bound

$$||J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)}(g_1)|| \leq \frac{\gamma(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_1|-1}}{(|g_1|-1)!}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $|g_1| = n+1$ is the number of operators (A or J) in g_1 . As discussed above, the sum over g_1 involving a particular $J^{(0)}(i_0)$ converges geometrically as $\gamma(c\gamma/\varepsilon)^n$.

2.3 Small Block Diagonalization

We need to diagonalize the Hamiltonian within small blocks. An n -site resonant block has 2^n eigenstates. Working with a sequence of length scales $L_k = (\frac{15}{8})^k$, with collars of width $L_k - 1$ around blocks, we require the diameter to be $< L_k$ for a block to be considered “small”. For small blocks, factors γ^{L_k} or ε^{L_k} will beat the sum over states.

We need to go further by requiring small blocks to be isolated, in the sense that a small block with n sites in step k is separated from other blocks on that scale (and later scales) by a distance $> d_m \equiv \exp(L_{m+m_0}^{1/2})$ for some m_0 , when $n \in [L_{m-1}, L_m)$. In the 1-body problem we may take collars logarithmic in n [32]. Here, we have to take collars linear in n , which pushes us into a regime with extended separation conditions. The additional separation $\exp(O(n^{1/2}))$ ensures that blocks do not clump together and ruin the exponential decay. In both cases the goal is to ensure that the combinatorics of graphical sums behave well in the multiscale analysis. The distance condition should be familiar to readers of [25]. As in that work, the construction ensures that uniform exponential decay is preserved away from resonant regions. But this benefit comes at the cost of working with loosely connected resonant blocks with weak probability decay.

For step one, small blocks are those with diameter $1 = \lfloor \frac{15}{8} \rfloor$, with a separation distance d_1 from other blocks. They will be denoted $b_\alpha^{(1)}$. We add a 1-step collar

neighborhood, and denote the result $\bar{b}_\alpha^{(1)}$. The remaining portion of $\mathcal{S}_1$ is given a 1-step collar to form $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{1'}$. Its components are denoted $\bar{B}_\alpha^{1'}$. We may also refer to $B_\alpha^{(1')} = \bar{B}_\alpha^{1'} \cap \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_{1'} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_1$.

Following our 1-body procedure, we gather terms that are internal to the collared blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ and $\bar{B}^{(1)}$. Put

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)\text{int}} &= J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(0)\text{res}} + \sum_{g_1: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}, g_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_1 \neq \emptyset, g_1 \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}_1} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)}(g_1) = J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)\text{sint}} + J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)\text{lint}} \\ J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)\text{ext}} &= \sum_{g_1: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}, g_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_1 = \emptyset} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)}(g_1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where $J^{(1)\text{sint}}$ contains terms of $J^{(1)\text{int}}$ whose graph is contained in a small block $\bar{b}^{(1)}$, and $J^{(1)\text{lint}}$ contains terms whose graph intersects a large block $\bar{B}^{(1)}$. Then

$$H^{(1)} = H_0 + J^{(1)\text{ext}} + J^{(1)\text{sint}} + J^{(1)\text{lint}}. \quad (2.12)$$

The next step is to diagonalize $H_0 + J^{(1)\text{sint}}$ within small blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$. Let O be the matrix that accomplishes this. It is a tensor product of matrices acting on the spin space for each small block (and identity matrices for spins elsewhere). Each block rotation affects only the spin variables internal to the block $\bar{b}^{(1)}$. Let $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(1)}$ be a one-step neighborhood of $\bar{b}^{(1)}$. The rotation depends on the spins in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(1)} \setminus \bar{b}^{(1)}$ and on the random variables in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(1)}$ only. The procedure here may seem overly complicated (after all, single site rotations could have been performed at the outset, simplifying the first step considerably). But we prefer to use a standard procedure so that the first step serves as a guide to later steps. The rotation produces a new effective Hamiltonian

$$H^{(1')} = O^{\text{tr}} H^{(1)} O = H_0^{(1')} + J^{(1')} + J^{(1)\text{lint}}, \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$H_0^{(1')} = O^{\text{tr}} (H_0 + J^{(1)\text{sint}}) O \quad (2.14)$$

is diagonal, and

$$J^{(1')} = O^{\text{tr}} J^{(1)\text{ext}} O = \sum_{g_1} O^{\text{tr}} J^{(1)}(g_1) O. \quad (2.15)$$

Note that $J^{(1)\text{lint}}$ is unaffected by the rotation. However, terms in $J^{(1)\text{ext}}$ that connect to small blocks are rotated. This necessitates an extension of the graph g_1 since transitions within a small block are produced. In effect, all the states in a small block can be thought of as a “metaspin” taking $2^{|\bar{b}^{(1)}|} = 8$ values (the same as the number of spin configurations in $\bar{b}^{(1)}$). Because of the rotation, there is no canonical way of associating states with spin variables, so we will often use generic labels α, β for block states. Let $g_{1'}$ label the set of terms obtained from the matrix product $O^{\text{tr}} J^{(1)}(g_1) O$. Then

$$J_{\alpha\beta}^{(1')} = \sum_{g_{1'}: \alpha \rightarrow \beta} J_{\alpha\beta}^{(1')}(g_{1'}) = \sum_{\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}, g_1} O_{\alpha\sigma}^{\text{tr}} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)\text{ext}} O_{\tilde{\sigma}\beta}. \quad (2.16)$$

Since the matrix elements of O for any block are bounded by 1, we maintain the bound $J_{\alpha\beta}^{(1')}(g_{1'}) \leq \gamma(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{1'}|-1}$, where $|g_{1'}| = |g_1|$, the size of the graph ignoring the rotation steps. As we proceed to later steps, we need to be sure that the size of the coupling will control the sums over $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}$.

2.4 Expectations of Observables

We are trying to prove estimates on expectations of local observable in eigenstates of H . For example, we would like to compute the expectation $\langle S_0^z \rangle_\alpha$ in any eigenstate α . We are trying to prove (1.4), which can be written as

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha |\langle S_0^z \rangle_\alpha| = 1 - O(\varepsilon), \quad (2.17)$$

(we can take $\varepsilon = \gamma^{1/20}$). At this stage of our analysis, we have approximate eigenfunctions given by the columns of ΩO . So we would like to prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha \left| \sum_{\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}} (O^{\text{tr}} \Omega^{\text{tr}})_{\alpha\sigma} (S_0^z)_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}} (\Omega O)_{\tilde{\sigma}\alpha} \right| = 1 - O(\varepsilon). \quad (2.18)$$

Then, as we proceed to better and better approximate eigenfunctions, this bound will become (2.17). Of course S_0^z is diagonalized in the σ -basis, so $(S_0^z)_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}} = \sigma_0 \delta_{\sigma_0\tilde{\sigma}_0}$, and (2.18) becomes

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha \left| \left| \sum_{\sigma} (O^{\text{tr}} \Omega^{\text{tr}})_{\alpha\sigma} \sigma_0 (\Omega O)_{\sigma\alpha} \right| - 1 \right| \leq O(\varepsilon). \quad (2.19)$$

Our construction depends on the collection of resonant blocks, so (2.19) is best understood by inserting a partition of unity $\sum_{\mathcal{B}} \chi_{\mathcal{B}}(\gamma)$ that specifies the blocks. Once this is done, we have two cases to consider: either 0 is in a resonant block, or it is not. If 0 is in a large block, there is actually no contribution because there is no rotation, so $\sigma_0 = \alpha_0 = \pm 1$. If 0 is in a small block, we can expect substantial mixing, leading to an expectation for S_0^z anywhere between -1 and 1, for any α . Thus for an upper bound, we can replace the integral of (2.19) with an indicator $\mathbb{1}_0(\gamma)$ for the event that 0 lies in a small block. We have established that the probability that a site is resonant is bounded by $4\rho_0\varepsilon$, so allowing for the two neighbors of 0, we get a bound of $12\rho_0\varepsilon$.

In the case where 0 is not in a resonant block, we rotate S_0^z :

$$\Omega^{\text{tr}} S_0^z \Omega = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A)^n}{n!} S_0^z \equiv \sum_{g_1} S_0^z(g_1). \quad (2.20)$$

This expansion is very much like the one derived for $J^{(1)}$; in particular it represents the expectation as a sum of local graphs. Note that the empty graph with $n = 0$ does not contribute, because it has modulus 1 and so disappears in (2.19). As we have seen, the

sum over g_1 converges geometrically, so the norm of the matrix $M = \sum_{|g_1| \geq 1} S_0^z(g_1)$ is bounded by $O(\gamma/\varepsilon)$. The rotation by O can affect terms with g_1 reaching to a block, but the norm is preserved, so $\text{Av}_\alpha |(O^\text{tr} M O)_{\alpha\alpha}|$ is likewise bounded by $O(\gamma/\varepsilon)$. Thus the contribution from this case to (2.19) is $O(\gamma/\varepsilon)$, uniformly in $\mathcal{B}$ (provided the set of blocks $\mathcal{B}$ does not contain 0). This completes the proof of (2.19), and hence also (2.18).

It should be clear that a similar analysis can be performed to give an expansion for the approximate expectation of any local operator, such as products of spin operators S_i^z or S_i^x at collections of sites i . If we consider the first-step truncated expectation $\langle \mathcal{O}_i; \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha^{(1)}$ for operator localized at or near i, j , there will be a cancellation of terms except for graphs extending from i to j . If we insert an indicator for the event that no more than half the ground between i and j is covered by resonant blocks, we obtain exponential decay. The probability of half coverage of $[i, j]$ by resonant blocks likewise decays exponentially (we will have to settle for weaker probability decay in later steps). Thus we see that

$$|\langle \mathcal{O}_i; \mathcal{O}_j \rangle_\alpha^{(1)}| \leq (c\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|i-j|/2}, \quad \text{with probability } 1 - (c\varepsilon)^{|i-j|/2}. \quad (2.21)$$

3 The Second Step

3.1 Resonant Blocks

It will be helpful to illustrate our constructions in a simpler context before proceeding to the general inductive step. We will be using a sequence of length scales $L_k = (15/8)^k$, with graphs sized in the range $[L_{k-1}, L_k)$ considered in the k^{th} step. So we will allow graphs of size 2 or 3 in the perturbation in the second step. Graphs that intersect resonant blocks have been rotated, so they now produce transitions in the “metaspin” space of the block. Still, it would be cumbersome to maintain a notational distinction between ordinary spins and metaspins, so we will use $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}$ to label spin/metaspin configurations. Labeling of states in blocks is arbitrary, but we may choose a one-to-one correspondence between ordinary spin configurations in a block $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ and metaspins/states in $\bar{b}^{(1)}$.

Each graph $g_{1'}$ induces a change in spin/metaspin configuration in the sites/blocks of $g_{1'}$. We define, for each $g_{1'}$ corresponding to a term of $J^{(1')}$, with $2 \leq |g_{1'}| \leq 3$,

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}}(g_{1'}) = \left| \frac{J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}(g_{1'})}{E_\sigma^{(1')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}} \right|. \quad (3.1)$$

Here $E_\sigma^{(1')}$ denotes a diagonal entry of $H_0^{(1')}$. These are “provisional” $A^{(2)}$ terms because not all of them will be small enough to include in $A^{(2)}$. Note that intrablock terms with $g_{1'} \subset \mathcal{S}_1$ are in $J^{(1)\text{int}}$, so are not part of $J^{(1')}$. We only consider off-diagonal terms here; in general, diagonal terms will renormalize energies, but will not induce rotations directly. Note that energies $E_\sigma^{(1')}$ are given by unperturbed values $\sum h_i \sigma_i + \sum J_i \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1}$

away from blocks, because corrections are second or higher order in γ ($|g_1| \geq 2$), so no change in H_0 is implemented in (2.12). Metaspin energies contribute to $E_\sigma^{(1')}$ in blocks $\bar{b}^{(1')}$.

We say that $g_{1'}$ from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$ is resonant in step 2 if $|g_{1'}|$ is 2 or 3, and if either of the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. } & |E_\sigma^{(1')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}| < \varepsilon^{|g_{1'}|}, \\ \text{II. } & A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}}(g_{1'}) > \frac{(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{1'}|}}{(|g_{1'}| - 1)!^{1/2}} \text{ with } |I(g_{1'})| \geq \frac{7}{8}|g_{1'}|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here, $I(g_{1'})$ is the smallest interval in $\mathbb{Z}$ covering all the sites or blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ that contain flips of $g_{1'}$, and $|I(g_{1'})|$ is the number of sites or blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ in $I(g_{1'})$. Condition II graphs have few duplicated sites, which means most energies are independent—this leads to good Markov inequality estimates. Graphs with $|I(g_{1'})| < \frac{7}{8}|g_{1'}|$ do not reach as far, so less decay is needed, and inductive estimates will be adequate. The combination will help us prove uniform bounds on the probability that $A^{(k)}$ fails to decay exponentially.

We define the scale 2 resonant blocks. Examine the set of all step 2 resonant graphs $g_{1'}$. Note that we include in $g_{1'}$ information about the starting spin configuration σ , since $g_{1'} : \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}$. We need to specify σ on $I(g_{1'})$ plus one neighbor on each side, because energies depend on σ one step away from sites/blocks where flips occur. These graphs involve sites and small blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$. The set of sites/blocks that belong to resonant graphs $g_{1'}$ are decomposed into connected components. The result is defined to be the step 2 resonant blocks $B^{(2)}$. They do not touch large blocks $B^{(1')}$. Small blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ can be linked to form a step 2 block, but unlinked small blocks are not held over as scale 2 blocks.

We define a set of small blocks $b^{(2)}$ by requiring that each $b^{(2)}$ has diameter $< L_2$, and any pair of blocks satisfies

$$\text{dist}(b_1^{(i)}, b_2^{(j)}) > d_m \equiv \exp(L_{m+m_0}^{1/2}), \text{ if } \min\{|b_1^{(i)}|, |b_2^{(j)}|\} \in [L_{m-1}, L_m], \quad (3.3)$$

for $i, j = 1, 2$. The leftover region $\mathcal{S}_{2'}$ is defined to be all portions of $B^{(2)}, B^{(1')}$ that fail to meet the criterion for small blocks. We further require that small blocks $b^{(i)}$ satisfy $\text{dist}(b_1^{(i)}, \mathcal{S}_{2'}) > d_m$ if $|b_1^{(i)}| \in [L_{m-1}, L_m]$. Since $B^{(2)}$ is new, some of the step 1 small blocks $b^{(1)}$ may be joined into $\mathcal{S}_{2'}$ or into some $b^{(2)}$. There is a unique way of extracting a maximal set of small blocks satisfying these conditions—see Subsection 4.2.1. We define $|b^{(2)}|$ to be the number of sites or blocks $b^{(1)}$ in $b^{(2)}$. However, any block $b^{(2)}$ with fewer than 2 sites/blocks is considered to have size 2 (because that is the minimum graph size for step 2). Let $\mathcal{S}_2$ denote $\mathcal{S}_{2'}$ plus the small blocks $b^{(2)}$.

We add a 3-step collar to $\mathcal{S}_2$. Since we do not expand graphs involving blocks of $\mathcal{S}_2$ at this stage, we need to enlarge these blocks into the region that such graphs can reach. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2$ is the collared version of $\mathcal{S}_2$, and its components are the collared small

blocks $\bar{b}^{(2)}$ and large blocks $\bar{B}^{(2')}$. The union of the $\bar{B}^{(2')}$ is denoted $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_2$, and then each $B^{(2')} \equiv \mathcal{S}_2 \cap \bar{B}^{(2')}$.

We would like a bound on the probability $P_{ij}^{(2)}$ that a block $B^{(2)}$ contains sites i, j . There must be a collection of resonant graphs $g_{1'}$ connecting i to j . However, because of dependence, we cannot simply take the product of the probabilities for each graph. We must find a collection of non-overlapping graphs which combine to cover at least half the distance from i to j . Here distance is measured in a metric where small blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ are contracted to points. Let $g_{1',1}$ be the graph covering the site i and extending farthest to the right. Then let $g_{1',2}$ be the graph that extends farthest to the right from $g_{1',1}$ (without leaving a gap). Continue until the site j is covered. It should be clear that the odd graphs do not overlap one another; likewise the even graphs are non-overlapping. (Any overlap would mean the in-between graph could have been dropped.) We may bound the probability of the whole collection of graphs by the geometric mean of the probabilities of the even and odd subsequences of $g_{1',k}$. As the complete sequence extends continuously from i to j , we will obtain exponential decay in the distance from i to j (but losing a factor of 2 in the rate due to the geometric mean).

The above construction reduces the problem of bounding $P_{ij}^{(2)}$ to the estimation of resonance probabilities for cases I and II in (3.2). With $|g_{1'}| = 2$, there is no case I since $\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}$ if the two flips are at the same site (if that site is in a $\bar{b}^{(1)}$, the term is internal to $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ and so is in $J^{(1)\text{int}}$, not $J^{(1')}$). With $|g_{1'}| = 3$, $|I(g_{1'})| = 1, 2$, or 3 . If $|I(g)| = 1$ or 2 , we are in case I. Let i be the site where $\sigma \neq \tilde{\sigma}$. If i is not in a block $\bar{b}^{(1)}$, then the energy difference from the flip at i is $\pm 2h_i + \text{const}$. Using a Markov inequality, the probability can be bounded by $\rho_1 \varepsilon^{|g_{1'}|}$, since we have a bound on the $-s = -\frac{4}{5}$ moment of h_i :

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} |2h_i - a|^{-s} \leq \rho_1. \quad (3.4)$$

If σ differs from $\tilde{\sigma}$ only in a block, then the energy difference $E_\sigma^{(1')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}$ is a difference of block energies. Here we need to make a similar assumption

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} |E_\sigma^{(1')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')} - a|^{-s} \leq \rho_1. \quad (3.5)$$

In general, we need to assume there is a constant ρ_1 such that the energy differences in resonant blocks $\bar{b}^{(k)}$ have $-s$ moments bounded as in (3.5), with a bound like $\rho_1^{L_k}$. This is equivalent to a statement about Hölder continuity of block energy differences, with bounds exponential in the volume of the block. Given (3.4), (3.5) we can say that the case I probabilities are all bounded by $(\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|g_{1'}|}$.

For case II, we have graphs with 2 or 3 flips, all at different sites/blocks. In general, if a graph has k flips or k different sites/blocks, this gives rise to a tree graph of energy denominators on $k+1$ “vertices,” *i.e.* the $k+1$ spin configurations linked by the denominators. Each link to a new site introduces a new random variable into the energy, so each denominator is independent. As a result, a Markov inequality with

(3.4), (3.5) can be used to bound the probability. For example, consider a particular $g_{1'}$ with $|g_{1'}| = 2$ and no blocks. We estimate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}} > (\gamma/\varepsilon)^2\right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \frac{(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}})^s}{(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{2s}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2s} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{|2h_i + a|^s |2h_i + 2h_{i+1} + b|^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Here $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}}$ is given by (3.1) with $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1)}$ having the structure $A(i)J(i+1)$. Here a, b are h -independent constants determined by the exchange interactions with neighboring spins. We may integrate over h_{i+1} with h_i fixed, using (3.4); then a second application of (3.4) bounds the right-hand side of (3.6). In general, we find that

$$P\left(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}} > (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{1'}|}\right) \leq (\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|g_{1'}|}. \quad (3.7)$$

It is worth noting that under nonresonant conditions (the negation of (3.2)) and nonresonant conditions inherited from the first step, all $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)\text{prov}}(g_{1'})$ have good bounds, not just the “straight” graph of condition II. For example, the three flip graph with one repeated site has two denominators $\geq \varepsilon$ and one $\geq \varepsilon^3$. The overall bound is $\gamma^3/\varepsilon^5 \leq \gamma^2$, which should be adequate since $|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}|$ is only 1. Similar estimates will work for the “crooked” non-condition II graphs for the general step.

As explained above, we may combine the estimates $(\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|g_{1'}|}$ on the probabilities of case I and II graphs to obtain a bound

$$P_{ij}^{(2)} \leq (c\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|i-j|^{(1)}/2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Here $|i-j|^{(1)}$ is a notation for the distance from i to j with blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ contracted to points. In fact, as long as i, j are not in the same block, $|i-j|^{(1)} \geq |i-j|/5$ due to the separation conditions. (For large enough m_0 , blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ are much farther apart than their diameters. So the worst case for this inequality is for i adjacent to the block containing j .) In later steps, more stringent separation conditions will ensure that $|i-j|^{(k)}$ remains comparable to $|i-j|$. This is important because when we sum over collections of non-overlapping resonant graphs covering half the distance from i to j , we need combinatoric factors $c^{|i-j|}$, and the decay in $|i-j|^{(1)}$ is adequate to control them. The combinatoric factors come from sums over $g_{1'}$, but these include sums over initial and final spin configurations in the blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ touched by $g_{1'}$. Thus the “combinatoric volume” is the full $|i-j|$. Note that as discussed earlier, there are factorials in $|g_{1'}|$ to consider, but since $|g_{1'}| \leq 3$ this is not an issue we need to worry about here.

We would also like a bound on $Q_{ij}^{(2)}$, the probability that i, j lie in the same small block $\bar{b}^{(2)}$. In the $P_{ij}^{(2)}$ bound, we considered only resonant graphs new to the second step. Here we allow new resonances (for which $2 \leq |g_{1'}| \leq 3$) and old resonances.

But keep in mind that isolated $b^{(1)}$ are no longer present in $B^{(2)}$. Hence if there is no $g_{1'}$, there must be at least two $b^{(1)}$ blocks. Either way, the probability is bounded by $(c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^2$. Recall that we have imposed the condition that the diameter of $b^{(2)}$ is $< L_2$, so we have a maximum diameter of 3. Thus

$$Q_{ij}^{(2)} \leq (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^2 \mathbb{1}_{|i-j|\leq 3}. \quad (3.9)$$

As we proceed to later steps, $P_{ij}^{(k)}$ will maintain uniform exponential decay, but $Q_{ij}^{(k)}$ will decay more slowly, like $\varepsilon^{O(k^2)}$ with $|i-j| \leq 4L_k$. Still, the decay is faster than any power of $|i-j|$, and it is sufficient to ensure that small blocks are unlikely. (Note that when $k \rightarrow \infty$, all blocks will be small.)

3.2 Perturbation in the Nonresonant Couplings

We group terms in $J^{(1')}$ into “perturbative” and “resonant” categories and write

$$J^{(1')} = J^{(1')\text{per}} + J^{(1')\text{res}}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $J^{(1')\text{per}}$ contains terms $g_{1'} = \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}$ with $2 \leq |g_{1'}| \leq 3$, $\sigma \neq \tilde{\sigma}$, and $g_{1'} \cap \mathcal{S}_2 = \emptyset$ (meaning all the sites/blocks in $g_{1'}$ are in $\mathcal{S}_2$). Graphs connected to the resonant region $\mathcal{S}_2$, large graphs ($|g_{1'}| \geq 4$) and diagonal terms ($\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}$) form $J^{(1')\text{res}}$. We put

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)} = \sum_{g_{1'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_{1'}) = \sum_{g_{1'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} \frac{J^{(1')\text{per}}}{E_{\sigma}^{(1')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}}. \quad (3.11)$$

We will need to resum terms with long graphs from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$, *i.e.* those with $|g_{1'}| > \frac{8}{7}|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}|$. These are extra small—see the discussion following (3.7)—so for probability estimates we do not need to keep track of individual graphs, and we can take the supremum over the randomness. Let $g_{1''}$ denote either a short graph from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$ or a special jump transition taking σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$ on an interval I . The length of $g_{1''}$ is defined to be 2. The jump transition represents the collection of all long graphs from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$ with a given $I(g_{1'})$. We call $g_{1'}$ short or long accordingly, and write

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_{1''}) = \begin{cases} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_{1''}), & \text{if } g_{1''} = g_{1'}, \text{ a short graph,} \\ \sum_{\text{long } g_{1'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_{1'}), & \text{if } g_{1''} \text{ is long.} \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

We may now define the basis-change operator $\Omega^{(2)} = \exp(-A^{(2)})$ and the new effective Hamiltonian

$$H^{(2)} = \Omega^{(2)\text{tr}} H^{(1')} \Omega^{(2)}. \quad (3.13)$$

Recalling that $H^{(1')} = H_0^{(1')} + J^{(1')} + J^{(1)\text{lint}}$ with $H_{0,\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')} = E_\sigma^{(1')} \delta_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(2)} &= H_0^{(1')} + J^{(1')\text{res}} + J^{(1)\text{lint}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{(n+1)!} (\text{ad} A^{(2)})^n J^{(1')\text{per}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A^{(2)})^n}{n!} J^{(1')\text{res}} \\ &= H_0^{(1')} + J^{(1')\text{res}} + J^{(1)\text{lint}} + J^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Since $J^{(1')}$ is second or third order in γ , all terms of $J^{(2)}$ are fourth order or higher.

The local structure of $J^{(2)}$ arises as before because $A^{(2)}, J^{(1')}$ are both sums of local operators. In particular, $[A^{(2)}(g_{1'}), J^{(1')}(\tilde{g}_{1'})] = 0$ if $\text{dist}(g_{1'}, \tilde{g}_{1'}) > 1$. (In later steps, the energies will receive new terms manifesting couplings over greater distances, and then a greater distance will be required for commutativity.) Suppressing spin indices, we have, for example

$$(\text{ad} A)^n J^{(0)\text{per}} = \sum_{g_{1',0}, \dots, g_{1',n}} \text{ad} A^{(2)}(g_{1',n}) \cdots \text{ad} A^{(2)}(g_{1',0}) J^{(0)}(g_{1',0}). \quad (3.15)$$

When summing over $g_{1',p}$ with $\text{dist}(g_{1',p}, \{g_{1',0}, \dots, g_{1',p-1}\}) \leq 1$, there are no more than $3p + 4$ choices for the starting site/block for $g_{1',p}$. Hence the sums over the initial points for the walks $g_{1',0}, \dots, g_{1',p}$ lead to a combinatoric factor no greater than $n!c^{|g_2|}$. Here g_2 is the walk in spin configuration space giving the sequence $g_{1',0}, \dots, g_{1',n}$, and $|g_2|$ is the sum of the lengths of the subwalks. The length of a graph is the number of transitions (or steps, if we think of a graph as a walk in spin configuration space.) Blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ do not affect graph lengths, but they do affect the counting of graphs, because the number of possible transitions in a block grows exponentially in the size of the block. Nevertheless, separation conditions ensure that the length of the region covered by g_2 is no greater than a fixed multiple of $|g_2|$. Altogether, the sum over g_2 (including its subgraphs $g_{1',0}, \dots, g_{1',n}$ and its initial spin configuration) is controlled by a combinatoric factor $n!c^{|g_2|}$. This is acceptable since we have factors of $1/n!$ in (3.14), and bounds on $A^{(2)}, J^{(1')}$ which decay exponentially in each $|g_{1'}|$. (Recall that $|A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_{1'})| \leq (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{1'}|}/(g_{1'} - 1)!^{1/2}$ from nonresonant conditions (3.2) and the discussion following (3.7); $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(1')}(g_{1'})$ is bounded in (2.10).)

We give a graphical representation for the new interaction

$$J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)} = \sum_{g_2: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_2), \quad (3.16)$$

and from the abovementioned bounds,

$$||J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_2)|| \leq \gamma(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_2|-1}/(g_2!)^{1/2}. \quad (3.17)$$

Here we introduce a notation $g_2!$ for $n!$ times the product of $(|g_{1',p}| - 1)!$ over the subgraphs of g_2 . (We did not need to be concerned about such factors for A 's, for

which $|g_{1'}| \leq 3$, but long graphs can occur in $J^{(1')\text{res}}$.) Terms in $J^{(2)}$ are short one denominator (compared to $|g_2|$, the number of transitions), and this accounts for the form of the bound (3.17). Note that the graph g_2 transitions from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$, so it is actually specifying a particular entry of the matrix $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}(g_2)$, with the others equal to zero. Thus a bound on the entry implies a bound on the norm. In the future we will focus on matrix entry bounds, since norm bounds follow automatically.

3.3 Small Block Diagonalization

In the last section we defined the small blocks that will be diagonalized here. They have core diameter $< L_2$ (3 or less) and a 3 step collar. The core can be formed from two 1-site blocks $b^{(1)}$, or from a 2- or 3-site block $b^{(1)}$ or $b^{(2)}$. These were the cases considered in the bound (3.9) on the probability of a block $\bar{b}^{(2)}$ containing i, j . Let us reorganize the interaction terms in (2.9) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(1')\text{res}} + J^{(1)\text{lint}} + J^{(2)} &= J^{(2)\text{ext}} + J^{(2)\text{int}} \\ &= J^{(2)\text{ext}} + J^{(2)\text{sint}} + J^{(2)\text{lint}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Here $J^{(2)\text{int}}$ contains terms whose graph intersects $\mathcal{S}_2$ and is contained in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_2$. Then $J^{(2)\text{lint}}$ includes terms of $J^{(2)\text{int}}$ that are contained in large blocks $\bar{B}^{(2)}$, and $J^{(2)\text{sint}}$ includes terms of $J^{(2)\text{int}}$ that are contained in small blocks $\bar{b}^{(2)}$, as well as second order diagonal terms for sites in S_2^c . All remaining terms of $J^{(2)}$ and $J^{(1')\text{res}}$ are included in $J^{(2)\text{ext}}$. This includes terms fourth order and higher in $J^{(1')\text{res}}$ that did not participate in the step 2 rotation (2.8), (2.9).

Now we let $O^{(2)}$ be the matrix that diagonalizes $H_0^{(1')} + J^{(2)\text{sint}}$. By construction, $J^{(2)\text{sint}}$ acts locally within small blocks, so $O^{(2)}$ is a tensor product of small-block rotations. Then define

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(2')} &= O^{(2)\text{tr}} H^{(2)} O^{(2)} \\ &= O^{(2)\text{tr}} (H_0^{(1')} + J^{(2)\text{ext}} + J^{(2)\text{sint}} + J^{(2)\text{lint}}) O^{(2)} \\ &= H_0^{(2')} + J^{(2')} + J^{(2)\text{lint}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where

$$H_0^{(2')} = O^{(2)\text{tr}} (H_0^{(1')} + J^{(2)\text{sint}}) O^{(2)} \quad (3.20)$$

is diagonal, and

$$J^{(2')} = O^{(2)\text{tr}} J^{(2)\text{ext}} O^{(2)}. \quad (3.21)$$

The new interaction has an expansion analogous to (2.16):

$$J_{\alpha\beta}^{(2')} = \sum_{g_{2'}: \alpha \rightarrow \beta} J_{\alpha\beta}^{(2')}(g_{2'}), \quad (3.22)$$

where $g_{2'}$ specifies rotation matrix elements $O_{\alpha\sigma}^{(2)\text{tr}}, O_{\tilde{\sigma}\beta}^{(2)}$, and a graph g_2 or $g_{1'}$ transitioning from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$. We specify that the length $|g_{2'}|$ is the same as that of the pre-rotation graph, even though part of the graph may be covered by a block $\bar{b}^{(2)}$.

Let us define cumulative rotations

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(1')} &= \Omega^{(1')} O^{(1)} \\ R^{(2')} &= R^{(1')} \Omega^{(2)} O^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Then it should be clear that the arguments used to prove (2.18) will allow us to obtain a similar result for the eigenfunctions approximated in step 2:

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha \left| \sum_{\sigma, \tilde{\sigma}} R_{\alpha\sigma}^{(2')\text{tr}} S_0^z R_{\tilde{\sigma}\alpha} \right| = 1 - O(\varepsilon). \tag{3.24}$$

The graphical expansions produced by commutators with S_0^z are very much like the ones we have been working with. We need to control the probability that O is in a small block $\bar{b}^{(1)}$ or $\bar{b}^{(2)}$, that is, $Q_{00}^{(1)} + Q_{00}^{(2)}$. From step 1, we know $Q_{00}^{(1)}$ is $O(\rho_1 \varepsilon)$, and from (3.9) we have that $Q_{00}^{(2)}$ is $O(\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^2$. Thus we obtain (3.24); likewise we can prove a bound analogous to (2.21) for truncated expectations. Further details will be left to the discussion in the general step.

4 The General Step

4.1 Starting point for the k^{th} step

Let $j = k - 1$. After j steps, we have small blocks $b^{(j)}$ with diameter $< L_j$ and separated from other parts of $\mathcal{S}_j$ by a distance $\geq \exp(2|b^{(j)}|^{1/2})$. Couplings in $J^{(j')}$ are $O(\gamma^{L_j})$, which will be sufficient to control sums over states in $\bar{b}^{(j)}$, since their number is no more than exponential in $|\bar{b}^{(j)}|$. Rotations have been performed in each $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ to diagonalize the Hamiltonian there up to terms of order L_j . Collar neighborhoods of width L_j ensure that no couplings from the j^{th} step expansion reach into $B^{(j)}$. At each stage we prove a bound

$$P_{xy}^{(j)} \leq (c\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|x-y|^{(j)}/2} \tag{4.1}$$

on the probability that x, y lie in a block $B^{(j)}$. Here $|x-y|^{(j)}$ refers to the distance from x to y with blocks $\bar{b}^{(m)}$ contacted to points for $m \leq j$.

Graphs $g_{j'}$ are multiscale graphs (or walks in spin space), with each step representing a graph from the previous scale. (The collection of graphs $g_{j'}$ has to be enlarged a bit to take into account nonlocal terms in the energies $E_\sigma^{j'}$ —specifically the way such terms mediate commutator connections between graphs. This will be discussed in detail in Section 4.3.) When unwrapped to the first scale, we obtain spatial graphs

$g_{j'}^s$ and denominator graphs $g_{j'}^d$. Resummed sections appear as jump steps with no denominators. Rotation matrix elements introduce intrablock “flips” of the metaspin variable labeling all the states in the block.

We inherit bounds from the j^{th} step:

$$|A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j)}(g_{(j-1)'})| \leq \begin{cases} (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{(j-1)'}|}/(g_{(j-1)'}!)^{1/2}, & \text{in general,} \\ \gamma^{|g_{(j-1)'}|}, & \text{if } g_{(j-1)'} \text{ is a jump step.} \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

We make use of an inductively defined formula for the factorials that appear in our procedure:

$$g_{(j-1)'}! \equiv n! \prod_{p=0}^n g_{(j-2)',p}!, \quad (4.3)$$

where $g_{(j-2)',0}, \dots, g_{(j-2)',n}$ are the subgraphs of $g_{(j-1)'}$ —see (3.15). As one unwraps the graph, factorials from earlier scales accumulate—but the process stops whenever a jump step is reached. The length of a jump step on an interval I is defined for any i to be

$$|g_{i''}| = |I| \vee \frac{7}{8}L_i, \quad (4.4)$$

where $|I|$ is the length of I in the metric $|x - y|^{(i)}$ in which blocks $\bar{b}^{(\tilde{i})}$ on scale $\tilde{i} \leq i$ are contracted to points. Interaction terms $J^{(j')}$ and $J^{(j)\text{lint}}$ have graphical expansions as in (3.21):

$$J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')} = \sum_{g_{j'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{j'}), \quad (4.5)$$

with bounds

$$|J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{j'})| \leq \gamma(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{j'}|-1}/(g_{j'}!)^{1/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

4.2 Resonant Blocks

Following the constructions from the second step, consider a graph $g_{j'}$ that labels a term of $J^{(j')}$ (so $g_{j'}$ does not intersect $\mathcal{S}_j$). We define a reduced graph $\bar{g}_{j'}$ that will be used for indexing event sums. It is defined from $g_{j'}$ by forgetting all substructure inside jump steps. In addition, there is a set of subgraphs of $g_{j'}$ that are called “erased”—these will be defined in Subsection 4.2.3. For erased subgraphs, we forget the order of further subgraphs, putting them into a standard left-to-right order. The length $|\bar{g}_{j'}|$ is the same as $|g_{j'}|$, and $\bar{g}_{j'}!$ is the same as $g_{j'}!$ (which has no factorials on jump steps). If $L_j \leq |g_{j'}| < L_{j+1}$, we define

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) = \left| \frac{\tilde{J}_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{j'}(\bar{g}_{j'})}{E_{\sigma}^{(j')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}} \right|, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{J}_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(\bar{g}_{j'})$ is the same as $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{j'})$ except jump steps are replaced with their upper bound $\gamma^{|g_{j''}|}$ from (4.2). We say that $\bar{g}_{j'}$ from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$ is resonant if either of the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I. } & |E_{\sigma}^{(j')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}| < \varepsilon^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|}, \\ \text{II. } & A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) > (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|}/(\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{1/2} \text{ with } |I(\bar{g}_{j'})| \geq \frac{7}{8}|\bar{g}_{j'}|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

It is important to understand that $\bar{g}_{j'}$ is a graph implementing a transition from some σ to some $\tilde{\sigma}$. Thus it specifies σ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ as well as the transitions that walk from σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$. Jump steps of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ specify a single transition of this walk, altering the spin configuration on the interval I of the jump step. The transition energies depend on σ out to a distance $\frac{15}{14}L_j$ from the flips of $\bar{g}_{j'}$, in the $|\cdot|^{(j)}$ metric (this will be verified inductively—see Section 4.3). So $\bar{g}_{j'}$ has to specify σ out to that distance. This leads to a proliferation of possibilities for $\bar{g}_{j'}$, but it is harmless because it is only exponential in L_j (or in $|\bar{g}_{j'}|$).

Let us take a moment to explain the key ideas behind this construction, as they are critical to the design of a procedure that yields bounds uniform in k . A resonant graph can be thought of as an event with a small probability. In order for a collection of graphs to be rare, we need to be able to sum the probabilities. In the ideal situation, where there are no repeated sites/blocks in the graph, the probability is exponentially small, so it can easily be summed. However, when graphs return to previously visited sites, dependence between denominators develops, and then the Markov inequality that is used to estimate probabilities begins to break down. Subgraphs in a neighborhood of sites with multiple visits need to be “erased,” meaning that inductive bounds are used, and they do not participate in the Markov inequality. (This means we use $P(AC > B\bar{C}) \leq E(A\bar{C})/B\bar{C} = E(A)/B$ when $\bar{C}$ is bound for C —so the variation of C is not helping the bound.) When there are a lot of return visits, a graph’s interval $I(g_{j'})$ is shortened by at least a factor $\frac{7}{8}$, and it goes into a jump step, where again we use inductive bounds. In this case, we have more factors of γ , and hence a more rapid decay in $|I(g_{j'})|$, and this provides the needed boost to preserve the uniformity of decay in the induction. (Fractional moments of denominators are finite, no matter the scale, which provides uniformity for “straight” graphs with few returns.) The net result is uniform probability decay, provided we do not sum over unnecessary structure, *i.e.* the substructure of jump steps and the order of subgraphs for erased graphs. A single bound on $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$ will imply corresponding bounds for $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(\bar{g}_{j'})$ for any $g_{j'}$ that reduces to $\bar{g}_{j'}$. One just needs to combine inductive bounds on the erased sections and jump steps with the probabilistic bound on $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$. One may think of $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$ as a sort of universal socket into which any graph $g_{j'}$ can be plugged, provided its subgraphs obey the required inductive bounds. There is no point in attempting to sum over events labeled by $g_{j'}$ because (1) it would involve summing the same event many times over and (2) probability bounds are not good enough to allow such an

uneconomical procedure.

We define the scale k resonant blocks. Examine the set of all resonant graphs $\bar{g}_{j'}$. The set of sites/blocks that belong $I(\bar{g}_{j'})$ for to resonant graphs $\bar{g}_{j'}$ are decomposed into connected components. These are the step k resonant blocks $B^{(k)}$. They do not touch large blocks $B^{(j')}$. Small blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{b}^{(j)}$ can be absorbed into blocks $B^{(k)}$, but only if they are part of a resonant graph $g_{j'}$.

We define a new set of small blocks $b^{(k)}$ by requiring that each $b^{(k)}$ has diameter $< L_k$, and any pair of blocks satisfies

$$\text{dist}(b_1^{(i)}, b_2^{(j)}) > d_m \equiv \exp(L_{m+m_0}^{1/2}), \text{ if } \min\{|b_1^{(i)}|, |b_2^{(j)}|\} \in [L_{m-1}, L_m). \quad (4.9)$$

(Here $|b^{(i)}|$ is the “core” volume, *i.e.*, the number of sites or blocks $\bar{b}^{(\tilde{i})}$, $\tilde{i} < i$ in $b^{(i)}$. But we establish the following convention: any block $B^{(i)}$ with fewer than L_{i-1} sites/blocks is considered to have size L_{i-1} when calculating volumes. This is because L_{k-1} is the minimum graph size considered in step k , and resonance probabilities are correspondingly small. This convention carries over to small blocks formed out of $B^{(i)}$ at stage $\tilde{i} \geq i$.) Note that this rule applies to small blocks on all scales up through k . This means that a $b^{(i)}$ with $i < k$ can be absorbed into the new resonant region if it is close enough to a $B^{(k)}$. It is easy to see that there is a unique way to decompose the complete resonant region (including blocks $B^{(j')}$, $B^{(k)}$ and $b^{(i)}$ with $i < k$) into a maximal set of small blocks on scales up through k satisfying diameter and separation conditions, plus left over large blocks $B^{(k')}$. One may proceed by forming proximity connections on successive length scales d_m . At each stage, connected components satisfying diameter and distance rules can be extracted as small blocks, and eliminated when constructing connected components on the next scale. We will not get any new blocks $b^{(i)}$ with $i < k$ but previous ones can be absorbed into a $B^{(k')}$ or a $b^{(k)}$.

To every block $B^{(k')}$ and $b^{(k)}$ we add a collar of width L_k in the metric $|\cdot|^{(j)}$. This is because we are not expanding graphs of size $< L_k$ that touch those blocks. Let $\mathcal{S}_k$ denote the union of the blocks $B^{(k')}$ and $b^{(k)}$, and let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_k$ denote the collared version. Its components may be divided into small blocks $\bar{b}^{(k)}$ and large blocks $\bar{B}^{(k')}$. The union of the $\bar{B}^{(k')}$ is denoted $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{k'}$, and then each $B^{(k')} \equiv \mathcal{S}_k \cap \bar{B}^{(k')}$, and $\mathcal{S}_{k'} \equiv \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{k'} \cap \mathcal{S}_k$.

The “geometric mean” construction of Section 3.1 shows that if x, y belong to the same resonant block $B^{(k)}$, then there must be a sequence of resonant graphs connecting x to y with the property that the even and odd subsequences consist of non-overlapping graphs. Thus we may focus on probability estimates for individual resonant graphs.

4.2.1 Graphical Sums

It will be helpful to use this subsection to describe how we control sums over multiscale graphs $g_{j'}$ or $\bar{g}_{j'}$. The goal is to replace any sum of graphs with a corresponding supremum, multiplied by a “combinatoric factor.” So a sum $\sum_g |f(g)|$ can be bounded by $\sup_g |f(g)|c(g)$ provided $\sum_g c(g)^{-1} \leq 1$. From (4.8), we see that A ’s will obey a

bound exponentially small in $|g_{j'}|$, times $(g_{j'}!)^{-1/2}$. We will obtain similar bound on resonance probabilities. Thus we need to be sure that combinatoric factors $c^{|g_{j'}|}(g_{j'}!)^{1/2}$ will be sufficient to control sums over $g_{j'}$.

Let us consider first the situation where $g_{j'}$ does not move through any blocks. We need to consider the combinatoric factors needed to control the sum over the structure of the level i subgraphs, $g_{i'}$, of $g_{j'}$. Each subgraph $g_{i'}$ has subgraphs $g_{(i-1)',0}, \dots, g_{(i-1)',n}$. We need to sum over the positions of the starting point (first flip) of each $g_{(i-1)',p}$. There can be gaps of size $\leq \frac{15}{14}L_{i-1}$ between each $g_{(i-1)',p}$ and the ones that came before. Naively, the sum over $g_{(i-1)',p}$ could produce a factor $O(L_i)p$, or $O(L_i^n)n!$ in total. But we use this bound only when summing over long graphs. For long graphs, we sum directly the series $(\text{ad}A)^n/n!$, so a combinatoric factor $n!$ is admissible. But then the $1/n!$ is gone from the estimate. This is the reason $g_{j'}!$ was defined with no contribution from jump steps, which represent sums of long graphs. Now let us consider the situation where $g_{i'}$ is short. There can be very little overlap between the $g_{(i-1)',p}$ —any overlap shortens $|I(g_{j'})|$, which must be at least $\frac{7}{8}|g_{j'}|$. It should be clear that no more than $n/8$ of the $g_{(i-1)',p}$ can fail to break new ground. The others are pinned to the left or right side of the growing graph, and do not produce factors of p . So short graphs can be controlled with a combinatoric factor $O(L_i^n)n^{n/8} = O(L_i^n)(n!)^{1/8}$.

To complete the bound, we need to take the product over all the subgraphs $g_{i'}$. Since the $g_{i'}$ each have size $\geq L_i$, there are no more than $|g_{j'}|/L_i$ factors of L_i . So we obtain a bound $\exp(O(1)|g_{j'}|L_i^{-1}\log L_i)$ times a product of eighth-power factorials. In view of the geometric increase, $L_i = (15/8)^i$, the product over $i < j$ gives a bound $c^{|g_{j'}|}(g_{j'}!)^{1/8}$, which is better than what is required. One way to think of this estimate is to compute the “combinatoric factor per site” L_i^{1/L_i} by dividing each factor L_i amongst L_i steps. As the product of L_i^{1/L_i} is bounded, the combinatorics are under control. Note that super-linear growth of L_i with i is required. We may control in a similar manner various other combinatoric factors bounded by c^n when the subgraph $g_{i'}$ has $n+1$ subgraphs. For example, the number of terms in $(\text{ad}A)^n J$, the choice of jump step or regular step, and the sum on n .

As we shall explain in Section 4.3, any time there is a gap between a subgraph $g_{(i-1)',p}$ and the collection $\{g_{(i-1)',0}, \dots, g_{(i-1)',p-1}\}$, it will be “filled in” by bridging graphs on earlier scales. Bridge graphs result from expanding the difference between two denominators that arise from a commutator $\text{ad}A^{(i)}(g_{(i-1)',p})$ applied to an operator associated with $g_{(i-1)',0}, \dots, g_{(i-1)',p-1}$. Bridge graphs are terms in the expansion for the energies (*i.e.* diagonal entries of the Hamiltonian), and have the same structure as off-diagonal graphs. One needs to choose the denominators that will be differenced: the sums can be controlled by combinatoric factors c^n for the subgraphs $g_{i'}$ of $g_{j'}$.

We need to establish some facts about comparability of the metric $|x-y|^{(j)}$ with $|x-y|$. The issue is that graphs exhibit decay in $|x-y|^{(j)}$ (blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}, i \leq j$ contracted to points) but there are counting factors exponential in the size of blocks—specifically sums over states or metaspins in blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ and background spin configurations in

$\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)} \setminus \bar{b}^{(i)}$. Blocks $b^{(j)}$ have size $< L_j$ and then $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ has a collar of width L_j in the metric $|x - y|^{(j-1)}$, and $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$ has a second collar of width $\frac{15}{14}L_j$. Comparability of the metrics will ensure that the size of $b^{(j)}$ increases by no more than a fixed factor, *e.g.* 10, in forming $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$. Then the state-counting factor $2^{|\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}|}$ can be controlled by the smallness of the graph, $(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{L_j}$ or its probability, ε^{L_j} . In some sense this is the crux of our method, since the maintenance of uniform exponential decay is essential for controlling state sums. Separation distances that grow rapidly with block size ensure that the fraction of distance lost to blocks is summable, and so $|x - y|^{(j)}$ is always at least a positive fraction of $|x - y|$. The construction is similar in spirit to that of [25].

The separation rule is that blocks $b^{(j)}$ have diameter $< L_j$ and any pair of blocks satisfies

$$\text{dist}(b_1^{(i)}, b_2^{(j)}) > d_m \equiv \exp(L_{m+m_0}^{1/2}), \text{ if } \min\{|b_1^{(i)}|, |b_2^{(j)}|\} \in [L_{m-1}, L_m). \quad (4.10)$$

This type of rule can generate blocks with large, hierarchically organized gaps. But there is a limit to how spread-out blocks can be. Consider a block $b^{(j)}$ with $|b^{(j)}| \in [L_{m-1}, L_m)$. If any gap in $b^{(j)}$ is greater than d_{m-1} , then it would divide $b^{(j)}$ into two parts. At least one of the parts would have volume $< L_{m-1}$ while being separated by a distance $> d_{m-1}$. This is impossible, because it would mean that part would have become a separate small block at some step $i \leq j$. (The diameter of the part is obviously smaller than L_j , since it is a subset of $b^{(j)}$ and $\text{diam}(b^{(j)}) < L_j$.) The limit on gap size implies that

$$\text{diam}(b^{(j)}) \leq (2^m - 2)d_{m-1}. \quad (4.11)$$

The superexponential growth of d_m with m ($d_m \approx d_{m-1}^{1.37}$) implies that the ratios $(2^m - 2)d_{m-1}/d_m$ are small, and furthermore their sum on m is small, for an appropriate choice of m_0 . This gives us the desired smallness of the fraction of distance occupied by blocks satisfying our separation conditions.

Now let us estimate the size of $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$. Note that a block $b^{(j)}$ has diameter in $[L_{j-1}, L_j)$, because if it were smaller than L_{j-1} , it would have been a block $b^{(i)}$ with $i < j$. Let us assume inductively that $\text{diam}(\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}) \leq 10 \text{diam}(b^{(i)})$ for $i < j$. Any blocks $b^{(i)}$ that might appear in the collar must obey the separation condition with respect to $b^{(j)}$. As in the discussion in the paragraph above, the ratios $10(2^m - 2)d_{m-1}/d_m$ are small and summable. Therefore, we can choose m_0 so that blocks $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ with $i < j$ take up a small fraction of the width of the collar. Since $b^{(j)}$ has a minimum diameter L_{j-1} , we see that adding the collar expands its size in $|\cdot|^{(j-1)}$ by no more than a factor $(2(1 + \frac{15}{14})L_j + L_{j-1})/L_{j-1} \leq 9$. Allowing for blocks $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ with $i < j$, we increase the factor to 10 and recover the inductive assumption.

Let us consider x, y with $|x - y|^{(j)} \geq L_j$, and prove comparability of metrics. (Of course we cannot expect comparability for points very close to blocks.) Allowing for a block $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$ with maximum size $(3 + \frac{15}{7})L_j$ in $|\cdot|^{(j-1)}$, plus a small amount of expansion from blocks on other scales, we find that $|x - y| \leq 7|x - y|^{(j)}$.

We will use a closely related estimate to handle a graph of size L_j touching a block $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ and/or blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ with $i < j$. We have an exponential factor like ε^{L_j} to work with, but the decay can be spread out over the blocks as well as the graph, and we get at least $1/7$ of the original decay rate. This is how we handle state sums that occur in any graphical sum. Similar issues arise in the single-body analysis of [32], but they were easier to handle because state sums were linear (rather than exponential) in the volume, so collars could be chosen logarithmic (rather than linear) in the volume of a block.

4.2.2 The Jacobian

In order to estimate probabilities of resonant graphs, we use the Markov inequality, bounding the expectation of each graph to the s power. Each graph has a number of energy denominators produced at various scales. We assume a hierarchically organized structure of denominators. Each denominator can be visualized as an arch over the collection of sites/blocks flipped in the associated subgraph. Denominators from later steps arch over earlier ones. Arches are either strictly contained in one another or else completely disjoint. This structure follows from the way denominators are introduced—see (4.7). However, if two subgraphs have a site/block in common, the underlying random variables are identified, creating unwanted dependence, which shows up graphically as overlapping arches. Therefore, we assume that as one proceeds up the hierarchy, there are no repeat visits, which means each new denominator introduces a new independent variable. Independence is used in the linear algebra sense, here and throughout this paper. We may need to throw out some denominators in order to find a set that has the hierarchical property. The details of how this is done will be deferred to the next subsection.

To leading order, each energy difference in the graph is a sum of energy differences of the sites/blocks of the graph. So we think of each site/block energy difference as an independent variable (but no more than one variable for each site/block). For example, a flip at site 1 produces an energy difference $2h_1 + a_1$. A flip at site 2 will produce an energy difference $2h_2 + a_2$ if compared to the previous configuration; it produces $2h_1 + 2h_2 + a_1 + a_2$ if compared to the starting configuration. Either way, the two denominators are independent. (Here a_1, a_2 are h -independent constants coming from the exchange interaction $J_i S_i^z S_{i+1}^z$.) If a third flip occurs at either site 1 or 2, the new denominator will not be independent, because it can be written as a linear combination of the first two denominators. In general, any flip at a new site will introduce a denominator independent of the ones that come before, simply because it introduced a new independent variable: the energy difference at the new site. Blocks will be treated as fat sites with metaspin variables. We allow for only one energy difference in the block to be considered independent (otherwise we would need to assume probabilistic properties about multiple energy differences in blocks). So only steps to

new sites/blocks introduce new variables that generate independent denominators. Our assumed bounds on the distribution of energy differences allow us to integrate the s power of each denominator in turn, keeping the unintegrated variables fixed. We are free to choose any set of independent denominators, even an incomplete (non-spanning) set. Any remaining denominators, including all non-independent denominators, are bounded in sup norm.

The above discussion applies to the leading order approximation for energies as a simple sum of contributions from sites/blocks. Terms like $J_i S_i^z S_{i+1}^z$ do not depend on the random variables in the sites/blocks they connect, so they merely introduce constant shifts as in the example above. However, as we saw in the second step, energies $E_\sigma^{(i')}$ receive perturbative contributions with $\mathbf{h}$ -dependent energy denominators. In the k^{th} step, energies $E_\sigma^{(j')}$ are updated to $E_\sigma^{(k')}$ through perturbative terms and from the eigenvalues of newly formed small blocks. Denominators in a graph for $E_\sigma^{(k')}$ depend on $E_\sigma^{(i')}$ for $i < k$. We want to check the dependence on the underlying random variables by differentiating with respect to h_i (or with respect to other random variables at our disposal). We apply the chain rule repeatedly, down to the first scale if possible. But when a derivative hits a block energy at the scale of its formation, we stop and apply our basic assumption on noncriticality of those energies. The graphical expansions are well controlled, so it should not be a surprise that they can be differentiated, and the Jacobian connecting a set of independent denominators of a graph to the underlying random variables is close to the noninteracting case.

Behavior of block energies. Block energy differences $E_\alpha^{(j')} - E_\beta^{(j')}$ depend on random variables out to a distance $\frac{15}{14}L_{j-1}$ from a block $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ in $|\cdot|^{(j-1)}$. This is from dependence of $H^{(j-1)'}$ on energies $E^{(i')}$, $i \leq j-1$. Recall that our parameter space is $\mathbf{h} = (h_i, J_i, \Gamma_i)$ with $\gamma_i = \gamma \Gamma_i$. The random variables h_i, J_i, Γ_i are independent, each having a continuous distribution supported on $[-1, 1]$, with all densities bounded uniformly by a constant ρ_0 . Thus if the block has size n there are no more than ηn parameters, for some fixed η . All eigenvalues have bounded derivatives with respect to these variables, since the operators S_i^z, S_i^x are bounded by 1 in norm. We need to assume that all energy differences are *noncritical*, i.e. at least one direction in the space of random variables produces a nonzero directional derivative. In practice, we will use a coordinate system in which energy differences move to first order with respect to one of the coordinates. Let us focus on the case of spherical coordinates since (as we will show in Chapter 5) radial derivatives can be bounded from below if there is a minimum level splitting. The angular coordinates will be treated as “spectator” coordinates, that is, fractional moments of energy denominators are bounded by integrating over the radial variable with bounds independent of the angles. Let $r = |\mathbf{h}|$ be the Euclidean norm of $\mathbf{h}$, and use it as the radial coordinate. We make the following assumption:

Assumption A1. (*Noncriticality of energy differences*) *There exists a constant c_b such that for all $\mathbf{h}$ and all pairs of eigenstates α, β for the matrix $H_0^{(j-1)'} + J^{(j)\text{ sint}}$ in a small*

block $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ of size n , the difference of eigenvalues satisfies

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (E_{\alpha}^{(j')} - E_{\beta}^{(j')}) \right|^{-1} \leq c_b^n, \quad (4.12)$$

with $c_b \leq \varepsilon^{-s_{\varkappa}}$, and $\varkappa$ a fixed, small constant.

We will relax this assumption in Chapter 5 by allowing failure on a set of small probability. But for simplicity, we work here with this strong noncriticality assumption.

For ease of exposition, let us introduce variables $\tilde{h}_x$ for each site/block x . For sites, $\tilde{h}_x = 2h_x$ so that bare energy differences move at unit speed. For each block in the graph of independent denominators, we let $\tilde{h}_x$ be the coordinate in the radial direction, rescaled so that $E_{\alpha}^{(j')}(\tilde{h}_x) - E_{\beta}^{(j')}(\tilde{h}_x)$ moves at unit speed. The eigenvalues are distinct, except on a curve of measure 0, given by the vanishing of the discriminant. (The discriminant cannot vanish identically. Take any magnetic fields $h_1, \dots, h_n$ in the block with no relation $\pm h_1 \pm h_2 \dots \pm h_n = 0$. As they are scaled to infinity together, they dominate all other terms in the Hamiltonian, and the eigenvalues are separated.) Therefore the eigenvalues are continuously differentiable. We illustrate with a simple one-site example, $H = \begin{pmatrix} h & \gamma \\ \gamma & -h \end{pmatrix}$, with both h, γ random. The eigenvalue difference is $2\sqrt{h^2 + \gamma^2} = 2r = \tilde{h}$ in polar coordinates, and the radial derivative of the eigenvalue difference is 2. Of course, if γ is not allowed to vary, we would have a critical point at $h = 0$, where assumption **A1** would fail.

We should point out that there is some arbitrariness in the selection of α, β in the blocks of the denominator graph. The denominators form a tree graph in spin/metaspin space, since by construction each new denominator goes to a configuration with a new site/block flipped. The choice of how to order the denominators can affect the choice of α, β in a block. Intervening flips may cause a change in state in the block, so that a second denominator may reflect a different state change at a block. However, once a block variable is linked into the expanding denominator graph, it is treated as fixed, along with any other energy difference in the block (we do not have enough information to treat other differences as independent.) Subsequent denominators depend on new variables outside the block, so they are independent of previous ones. There is also some arbitrariness in the selection of variables when there are fewer denominators than sites/blocks being flipped. In such cases extra variables may be treated as fixed, all analysis done uniformly with respect to the values of the extra variables.

It will be helpful to order the denominators in the graph $g_{j'}$ as follows. First run through the denominators from the first step (single spin flips). Then proceed to denominators introduced in the second step (graphs $g_{1'}$ with two or three steps—the new denominator coming from an $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(2)}$ with $\sigma\tilde{\sigma}$ differing by two or three flips. Continue through all length scales up to j . Each denominator in the sequence introduces a new independent variable $\tilde{h}_y$, and it is convenient to number the $\tilde{h}_y$'s in the same order as

the denominators. Let us introduce the notation

$$D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')} = E_{\sigma}^{(j')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')} \quad (4.13)$$

for the denominator connecting σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$. The dependence on $\tilde{h}_y$ is given by the leading term from scale 0 (or from scale i for energies of blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$) plus corrections given by graphical expansions. Thus

$$\frac{\partial D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} = \pm(1 - \delta_{\sigma(y)\tilde{\sigma}(y)}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sum_{g_{i'}} \left(J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(i')}(g_{i'}) - J_{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}}^{(i')}(g_{i'}) \right), \quad (4.14)$$

where the Kronecker δ makes the leading term 1 if and only if $\sigma(y) \neq \tilde{\sigma}(y)$. The corrections come from diagonal entries of $J^{(i')}$ that were absorbed into $H_0^{(j')}$, as discussed in Section 3.3. They also come from differences $E_{\sigma}^{(i')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(i')}$ arising from energies of blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ from diagonalization as in (3.20). To keep the notation in (4.14) simple, let us allow $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(i')}$ to refer either to the initial block energies or to the perturbative corrections at subsequent scales. We defer for a moment the discussion of block energy differences, and focus now on the perturbative terms. They obey bounds as in (4.6). Note that our ordering convention implies that the matrix $\pm(1 - \delta_{\sigma(y)\tilde{\sigma}(y)})$ is lower triangular, with ± 1 's on the diagonal, and ± 1 or 0 below the diagonal. (Here the pair $\sigma\tilde{\sigma}$ runs over n choices coming from the n denominators, and y runs over the n independent variables.) Thus to leading order, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian are ± 1 . Our challenge now is to show the corrections are small.

Applying the chain rule to (4.14), the derivatives flow to the denominator energies in each term $J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(i')}(g_{i'})$ or $J_{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}}^{(i')}(g_{i'})$. We need to be cognizant of the fact that jump steps in $g_{i'}$ are actually sums of (long) graphs, and these graphs have denominators which will depend on $\tilde{h}_y$. So for the purposes of this discussion, we expand out every jump step at level $i < j$ into the sum of all its constituent graphs, see (3.12) or (4.33). The grouping of graphs into jump steps is a convenient way to keep track of the way estimates from smaller scales merge with Markov inequality bounds to produce bounds on longer scales. But when needed we may go back to the underlying sum of graphs. Another point to mention is the fact that the energy graphs $g_{i'}$ do not have the “independent denominator” property that we assume for $g_{j'}$ —it is not needed because we have inductive bounds on those graphs. When we apply the chain rule to (4.14), we obtain a sum of terms with one of the denominators in $g_{i'}$ duplicated; the extra denominator can be bounded as in (4.8I), and the original graph is bounded as in (4.6). Thus we have a bound

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(i')}(g_{i'}) \right| \leq \frac{(c\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{|g_{i'}|} \sup}{(g_{i'}!)^{1/2}} \tau \tilde{\tau} \left| \frac{\partial D_{\tau\tilde{\tau}}^{(i')}}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} \right|, \quad (4.15)$$

where the constant c is inserted to account for the sum of denominators $\tau\tilde{\tau}$ in $g_{i'}$. We may now repeat the process, inserting (4.14) on scales $i < j$. There is a leading term

± 1 , plus further graphical expansions. Then ± 1 terms and the expansion terms are localized near the places where $\tau \neq \tilde{\tau}$, so there needs to be a sum over such sites—but there are no more than $|g_{i'}|$ of them, so the sum can be handled with an increase in the constant c in (4.15). The process stops when scale 1 or a block $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ is reached, at which point the derivative produces a factor ± 1 . Repeatedly applying the bounds from the last section on graphical sums, we find that

$$\frac{\partial D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} = \pm(1 - \delta_{\sigma(y)\tilde{\sigma}(y)}) + O(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{1+\text{dist}(y, \sigma\Delta\tilde{\sigma})}, \quad (4.16)$$

where $\sigma\Delta\tilde{\sigma}$ is the set of sites/blocks where $\sigma \neq \tilde{\sigma}$; $\text{dist}(y, \sigma\Delta\tilde{\sigma})$ is the number of steps from y to $\sigma\Delta\tilde{\sigma}$.

Let us return to the case of derivatives of block energy differences. When a derivative hits a block energy, it flows to the Hamiltonian of the block and we have to take the expectation of the resulting operator. The Hamiltonian is given by a leading term plus a graphical expansion with $\tilde{h}$ -dependence in the denominators. We are only concerned with terms that depend on $\tilde{h}_y$ for y outside the block. All the terms are bounded in norm as in (4.6), so we can proceed to apply the chain rule as discussed above, and the resulting bounds serve to control the derivatives of block energies. As for the perturbative terms, we end up with decay from the block to y for the derivative of a block energy with respect to $\tilde{h}_y$, and (4.16) remains valid.

The denominator $D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}$ is part of a graph that specifies a sequence of flips taking σ to $\tilde{\sigma}$. We write $D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}$ as a sum of energy differences for each spin flip:

$$D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')} = \sum_x d_x^{(j')}. \quad (4.17)$$

Note that $d_x^{(j')}$ depends on the spin configuration out to a distance $O(L_j)$, but we do not make the dependence explicit in the notation. Of course, each $d_x^{(j')}$ is just a local difference of energies, so as a special case of (4.16) we have an estimate:

$$\mathcal{J} \equiv \frac{\partial d_x^{(j')}}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} = \pm \delta_{xy} + O(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{1+\text{dist}(x,y)}. \quad (4.18)$$

Now letting x, y run over the n sites/blocks with the independent variables, we may write the Jacobian in matrix notation: $\mathcal{J} = \tilde{I} + \Delta$. Here $\tilde{I}$ is a modified identity matrix, with signs allowed. The matrix Δ has small row and column sums, from the decay in (4.18). Hence $\|\Delta\| = O(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)$. As Δ cannot move the eigenvalues of $\tilde{I}$ by more than that amount, we see that

$$|\log |\det \mathcal{J}|| \leq O(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)n. \quad (4.19)$$

Let L be the matrix $1 - \delta_{\sigma(y)\tilde{\sigma}(y)}$, which, as previously noted, is lower triangular. (But now, with the signs removed, it has 1's on the diagonal.) The matrix L expresses the

relation (4.17) between the denominators and the single flip energies $d_x^{(j')}$. Thus the full Jacobian $\partial D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}/\partial \tilde{h}_y$ is $L\mathcal{J}$, and its determinant is the same as $\det \mathcal{J}$, with the same bound (4.19). Thus we obtain the main result of this section:

Proposition 4.1. *Assume **A1** and inductive bounds (4.6) and (4.8I). Then any system of n hierarchically organized denominators obeys the following Jacobian bound:*

$$\left| \log \left| \det \frac{\partial D_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}}{\partial \tilde{h}_y} \right| \right| \leq O(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)n. \quad (4.20)$$

Note that the choice of normalization for the variables $\tilde{h}_y$ obscures the size of the lower bound (4.10) on the rate of variation of eigenvalue differences with the original variables. When estimating fractional moments of energy denominators, we will need to include factors $c_b^{n_y}$ when the block at y has size n_y .

It turns out that the multidominator estimates of the next subsection can be organized so as to avoid working with block energy variables. Those estimates are mainly about getting uniform exponential decay, and due to the diluteness of resonant blocks, the decay can be extracted from the spaces between blocks. Nevertheless, the case $n = 1$ of (4.19) is indispensable for controlling single-denominator resonances, in particular for block energies.

4.2.3 Resonant Graphs

The Jacobian bounds allow us to estimate probabilities of resonant graphs. First, let us consider case *I* of the resonant condition (4.8). This is a single denominator estimate, so by (4.20) with $n = 1$, we see that the energy difference moves at close to unit speed with the variation of any one of the variables corresponding to flips of spins/metaspins in the transition $\sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}$. So the resonance probability is proportional to $\varepsilon^{|\tilde{g}_{j'}|}$. In the case of a block variable for some $\bar{b}^{(i)}$, there is also a factor of the area of the sphere of radius r in $\mathcal{R}^{\eta L_i}$, since there are up to ηL_i random variables in $\bar{b}^{(i)}$. However, since $r \leq \sqrt{\eta L_i}$, one can bound it by c^{L_i} for some c . Also, the rescaling $r \rightarrow \tilde{h}_y$ leads to a factor $c_b^{|\bar{b}^{(i)}|} \leq c^{L_i}$ from (4.12). As discussed in the section on graphical sums, our constructions ensure that $|\tilde{g}_{j'}|$ is always large enough so that exponentials in block sizes can be absorbed into the exponential decay in $|\tilde{g}_{j'}|$. Thus the probability for condition (4.8I) is bounded by $(\rho_1 \varepsilon)^{|\tilde{g}_{j'}|}$, for some constant ρ_1 .

Next, let us consider probability bounds for case *II* of (4.8). Long graphs will be resummed, so we only need to work with short graphs $g_{j'}$. Consider the simplest case in which all the denominators in $g_{j'}$ are independent. This will happen if there are no multiple visits to sites/blocks in $g_{j'}$, which means that each flip introduces a new independent variable. (Note that a variable for a block $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ must be part of a graph that

extends into $\bar{b}^{(i)}$, which we count as a repeat visit. So we do not have block variables in this example.) Then, with $s \leq \frac{4}{5}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) > \frac{(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|}}{(\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{1/2}} \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \frac{(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}))^s (\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{s/2}}{(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{s|\bar{g}_{j'}|}} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^{s|\bar{g}_{j'}|}}{(\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{s/2}} \mathbb{E} \prod_{\tau \tilde{\tau} \in G_k^{\text{d}}} \left| E_{\tau}^{(i')} - E_{\tilde{\tau}}^{(i')} \right|^{-s}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Here G_k^{d} is the denominator graph for $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$, which is the same as the denominator graph of $J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{j'})$, plus the denominator for $\sigma\tilde{\sigma}$ —recall the definition (4.7). Every elementary flip comes with a factor γ , so all factors of γ cancel on the right-hand side of (4.7). Jump steps contribute their share of factors of γ because of the improved bound $|A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{(j-1)'})| \leq \gamma^{|g_{(j-1)'}|}$, which is used in place of jump steps in $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$, see (4.2). But this is the only use of inductive bounds—the rest of the graph has all its subgraphs expanded out to the level of elementary flips. As $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'})$ contains $(\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{-1}$, the product of all the inverse factorials of its subgraphs, we may divide it between both sides of the Markov inequality. What remains are the denominators: the fact that their s -moments are bounded allows us to extract good decay of the probability with $|\bar{g}_{j'}|$. The Jacobian estimate from the last section shows that we can effectively use the denominators as integration variables, with a Jacobian bounded in (4.20). We conclude that the moments are bounded by a factor exponential in $|\bar{g}_{j'}|$. Thus there is a constant ρ_1 such that

$$P \left(A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) > (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|} / (\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{1/2} \right) \leq (\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|} / (\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{s/2}. \quad (4.22)$$

Next we consider the general argument for bounding the probability of (4.8II). The idea is that sections of the graph where repeated sites/blocks occur have to be short—otherwise the graph cannot reach far enough in $\mathbb{Z}$ to satisfy the condition $|I(\bar{g}_{j'})| \geq \frac{7}{8}|\bar{g}_{j'}|$. Inductive bounds will be applied for sections of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ that overlap with each other. For such sections, there is no gain in the Markov inequality, and no decay as in (4.18) in the size of the subgraph. But we retain decay on a substantial fraction of $\bar{g}_{j'}$, and so a bound similar to (4.22) can still be proven.

Let us review some basic facts about the structure of $\bar{g}_{j'}$. It consists of a number of subgraphs $\bar{g}_{(j-1)'}$, and each $\bar{g}_{(j-1)'}$ consists of subgraphs $\bar{g}_{(j-2)'}$, and so on. (We can also have subgraphs two or more levels down.) Thus we have a hierarchical, nested structure. A subgraph corresponding to an A factor has an overall denominator (if it is not a jump step). A subgraph corresponding to a J factor has no overall denominator. Any further A subgraphs come with their own overall denominators. Thus the denominators respect the hierarchical organization of $\bar{g}_{j'}$. Each denominator depends to leading order only on the variables within its associated subgraph. When there are no repeated

sites, the hierarchical organization of denominators translates to the spatial structure of denominators (and leads to the lower triangularity of the matrix L of the previous subsection.) For each subgraph, let $I(\bar{g}_{i'})$ denote the smallest interval of sites or blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ containing all the flips of $\bar{g}_{i'}$ (for jump steps, we include all the sites covered by the jump). Clearly, if $I(g) \cap I(\tilde{g}) = \emptyset$, then there is no dependence between the variables in $I(g)$ and $I(\tilde{g})$. Any overlap between $I(g)$ and $I(\tilde{g})$ will necessarily shorten the distance $|I(\bar{g}_{j'})|$ that $\bar{g}_{j'}$ can span.

If we look at the entire interval $I(\bar{g}_{j'})$, there will be a set of disjoint segments in $\mathbb{Z}$ where sites/blocks are covered more than once due to repeated flips of $\bar{g}_{j'}$. We call these segments “looping segments,” because the graph is looping back to previously visited sites. We can assume that any two looping segments T_α, T_β have at least one site or block $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ between that is not in a looping segment. Let $|T_\alpha|$ denote the size of a segment, where each site/block with n visits is weighted by a factor $n - 1$. Visits are counted by looking at the individual flips of $\bar{g}_{j'}$; any jump step counts as a visit to all the sites/blocks covered by the jump. Note that some flips of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ can occur at places that are subsequently subsumed into a block—nevertheless all the flips inside such a block count as separate visits to the block. Every time $\bar{g}_{j'}$ returns to a previously visited site/block, it fails to extend $I(\bar{g}_{j'})$. Hence the sum of the lengths $|T_\alpha|$ of the looping segments equals $|\bar{g}_{j'}| - |I(\bar{g}_{j'})|$. This must be less than $\frac{1}{8}|\bar{g}_{j'}|$, by the condition for short graphs (4.8II).

Let us consider the denominator graph prior to the identification of variables in the looping segments; each flip of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ is associated with an independent variable. All denominators are independent. This can be seen by observing inductively that the property holds for A subgraphs; J subgraphs always have a free variable, which makes the overall denominator on the next scale independent. Of course, a repeat visit to a looping segment forces us to identify variables of the flips with earlier variables, and independence is lost. However, denominators from a sufficiently long length scale do retain their independence. Let $\ell = 2 \max_\alpha |T_\alpha|$, and let i be such that $\ell \in [L_{i-1}, L_i)$. Consider the denominator subgraph $\mathcal{D}_i$ formed by links introduced at step i and afterwards, with graph length in the range $[L_i, L_{i+1})$. As a subgraph of a graph with independent denominators, the denominators of $\mathcal{D}_i$ are independent. Furthermore, even after the identification of variables, the denominators in $\mathcal{D}_i$ are independent. This is because each denominator covers at least L_i variables, and since identifications occur within disjoint T_α with $2|T_\alpha| \leq \ell < L_i$, there will always be a free variable for each denominator. (If there are n visits to a site/block, then n variables are identified there, and the site/block contributes $n - 1$ to $|T_\alpha|$. Hence no more than $2|T_\alpha|$ variables are lost in T_α . Once a denominator extends outside of T_α , it spans an independent variable adjacent to T_α —by construction, there are gaps of size ≥ 1 between the T_α , and they contain only singly-visited sites/blocks.)

As we add denominators from the $(i - 1)^{\text{st}}$ step and below, some will be internal to one of the looping segments (*i.e.*, all the variables on which the denominator de-

penders are in the looping segment). We will have to replace the corresponding A 's by uniform bounds $(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g|}/(g!)^{1/2}$ from (4.2). The denominator is effectively erased from the denominator graph, along with all denominators nested inside. There may be denominators on scale $i - 1$ or above that connect T_α to its complement. (Again, we may visualize a denominator as an arch that encompasses all of its variables.) In order to keep those denominators independent, we may need to drop a denominator on scale $i - 1$ or below on either side of T_α . This is so that a variable on either side of T_α is freed up (*i.e.* it is no longer used to integrate short denominators, so it is available for integrating long denominators.) On each side, we choose a denominator that extends at least one step away from T_α . It can start inside of T_α or at the first site outside of T_α . In order to free up the denominator on scale i , we need to erase a denominator that is directly subsidiary to it, *i.e.* up to scale $i - 1$. See Figure 1.




Figure 1: Denominators to the right of T_α . In this example, denominators d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5 are no longer independent once h_1 and h_2 are frozen. Therefore, d_4 is dropped, along with subsidiary denominators d_2, d_3 . This frees up h_3 . Then d_5 has an independent variable.

Through this construction, we obtain a denominator graph $\mathcal{D}_{i-1}$, consisting of non-erased denominators on scales $\geq i - 1$. All of the denominators are independent, even with the variables in T_α 's with $|T_\alpha| \in [L_{i-1}, L_i)$ frozen. We continue through shorter length scales, erasing denominators as needed to preserve independence after the freezing of variables in the T_α . Each looping segment with $|T_\alpha| \in [L_{i-1}, L_i)$ may have a collar of erased sections of width $< L_i$ on each side. The looping segment “spoils” an interval of size no longer than $2|T_\alpha| + 2L_i \leq (2 + 2 \cdot \frac{15}{8})|T_\alpha| < 6|T_\alpha|$. (One could do better with a more detailed analysis.) Recall that the total length of all the looping segments is no greater than $\frac{1}{8}|g_{j'}|$. Thus the total length of the “spoiled” intervals where non-probabilistic bounds are employed is no greater than $\frac{3}{4}|\bar{g}_{j'}|$. This leaves at least $\frac{1}{4}$ of the denominators independent, and hence usable in the Markov inequality.

Note that block variables are automatically eliminated with this procedure, because

graphs traversing $\bar{b}^{(i)} \setminus \bar{b}^{(i)}$ are treated as multiple visits to $\bar{b}^{(i)}$, which leads to erasures near the block. They cannot be eliminated when estimating probabilities for case I of (4.8). However, that is a single-denominator estimate, so the issue of correlation between denominators does not arise.

We may now return to the probability bound as in (4.22), only now any graph with $|I(\bar{g}_{j'})| \geq \frac{7}{8}|\bar{g}_{j'}|$ is allowed. We obtain

$$P\left(A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) > \frac{(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|}}{(\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{1/2}}\right) \leq (\rho_1 \varepsilon^s)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|/4} / (\bar{g}_{j'}^e!)^{s/2}. \quad (4.23)$$

The “erased” sections of $g_{j'}$ contribute factors of γ/ε instead of γ in the expectation, so they contribute no smallness to the bound on the probability. But at least $1/4$ of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ is clear of dependence issues, so we are able to glean $|\bar{g}_{j'}|/4$ factors of ε^s in the Markov inequality. The factorials for the various subgraphs of $\bar{g}_{j'}$ do not all make it to the right-hand side of (4.19), however. For erased sections, the bounds applied contain exactly the same factorials as in the left-hand side of (4.23). So they cancel out in the Markov inequality ratio (just like the factors γ/ε in erased sections). As a result, the right-hand side of (4.23) uses a modified factorial, $\bar{g}_{j'}^e!$, which contains only the factorials in non-erased sections. Recall that the graph $\bar{g}_{j'}$ is defined from $g_{j'}$ by forgetting the order of subgraphs in erased sections. The order only affects denominators internal to erased sections; the rest of the graph is unaffected, as it only involves the energies at the start and finish of erased sections. So in $\bar{g}_{j'}$ we sum over the usual graphical structures, but some subgraphs are specified as erased, which means any further collections of subgraphs are ordered from left to right. We do not worry about whether these graphs’ initial and final states match up properly. The point is to organize the event sum so that the erased factorials are not needed. The event $\{A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)\text{prov}}(\bar{g}_{j'}) > (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|\bar{g}_{j'}|} / (\bar{g}_{j'}!)^{1/2}\}$ contains all events corresponding to any $g_{j'}$ which reduces to $\bar{g}_{j'}$ after the erasure procedure. So there is no point in counting them all separately. With this procedure, sums over subgraphs in erased sections can be organized from left to right, so no factorials are needed to control them. (The leftmost point of any subgraph starts at a point within or immediately adjacent to the previous subgraph, so there is no factor that depends on the number of subgraphs in a collection.) This only works for event sums; graphs such as $A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j'})$ depend on the ordering of all their subgraph collections, so we retain that structure and the factorials that go with it.

4.2.4 Block Probabilities

The bound (4.23) ensures that there is a positive density of factors of ε^s as we estimate $P_{xy}^{(k)}$, the probability that x, y lie in the same block $B^{(k)}$. As in the proof of (3.8), we lose a factor of two in the decay from the geometric mean construction. Other aspects of the sum over graphs were described in Subsection 4.2.1, in particular the fact that

only eighth-power factorials are needed to control sums over collections of subgraphs. As we just discussed, those factorials are not needed for erased sections, since we are now summing over coarser partitions of events based on $\bar{g}_{j'}$, but still satisfying the bound (4.23). Thus we obtain a bound

$$P_{xy}^{(k)} \leq (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{(|x-y|^{(j)} \vee L_j)/8}. \quad (4.24)$$

Recall that $j = k-1$ and $|x-y|^{(j)}$ is the metric in which blocks $\bar{b}^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{b}^{(j)}$ are contracted to points. Uniform comparability of $|x-y|^{(j)}$ with $|x-y|$ was established in Subsection 4.2.1. Resonant graphs in the k^{th} step have $L_j \leq |g_{j'}| < L_{j+1}$, which leads to the minimum in the exponent above.

Let us consider bounds on $Q_{xy}^{(k)}$, the probability that x, y lie in the same small block $\bar{b}^{(k)}$. This event can occur with a fairly spaced out collection of resonant blocks from earlier scales. However, the factors of ε^s in (4.24) control the sum over core sets $b^{(k)}$ consistent with the event $Q_{xy}^{(k)}$. Let us break up $b^{(k)}$ into components $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$ by connecting any pair of sites with separation distance $< d_{m+1}$. Each component $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$ has 1 or more subcomponents $\mathcal{C}^{(m-1)}$, and so on. If there is more than one subcomponent, the sum over each separation distance produces a combinatoric factor d_{m+1} which bounds separation distances within $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$. Our separation rules state that if a subset has volume in $[L_m, L_{m+1})$ and is separated by a distance d_m , then it would form a small block $b^{(j)}$ or an earlier scale. Since that did not happen for components $\mathcal{C}^{(m-1)}$, and they are separated from each other by at least d_m , they have a minimum volume L_{m+1} . Thus the combinatoric factor per site of $\mathcal{C}^{(m-1)}$ is bounded by $d_{m+1}^{1/L_{m+1}}$. If we combine the combinatoric factors per site produced by subcomponent sums on all scales we obtain

$$\prod_m (d_{m+1})^{1/L_{m+1}} = \exp\left(\sum_m L_{m+m_0+1}^{1/2} L_{m+1}^{-1}\right) \leq c. \quad (4.25)$$

Since (4.24) provides a factor ε^s for each site of $b^{(k)}$, it should be clear that the sum over $b^{(k)}$ is under control.

We established in Subsection 4.2.1 that the separation conditions imply that any small block with core volume $|b^{(k)}| \in [L_{m-1}, L_m)$ has diameter less than $(2^m - 2)d_{m-1}$. But note that if $(2^m - 2)d_{m-1} < L_{k-1}$, then $b^{(k)}$ would have satisfied the diameter conditions $\text{diam}(b^{(k)}) < L_k$ in an earlier step. Hence all blocks $b^{(k)}$ satisfy a minimum volume condition:

$$|b^{(k)}| \geq L_{m-1}, \text{ where } m \text{ is the smallest integer such that } (2^m - 2)d_{m-1} \geq L_{k-1}. \quad (4.26)$$

Recall that $d_m \equiv \exp(L_{m+m_0}^{1/2})$ and $L_k \equiv (15/8)^k$. Thus (4.26) implies that $L_{m-1+m_0} \geq c_1(k-1)^2$, which means that

$$|b^{(k)}| \geq 1 + c_2 k^2 \geq 1 + c_3 (\log(|x-y|/4 \vee 1))^2. \quad (4.27)$$

Here we make use of the fact that if $x, y \in \bar{b}^{(k)}$, $|x - y| \leq 4L_k$. (The bound $|\bar{b}^{(k)}| < 4L_k$ follows as in the discussion at the end of Subsection 4.2.1) The key aspect of (4.24) is that it establishes a minimum density of factors of ε^s throughout the core volume of $b^{(k)}$. (This includes the extra volume coming from the minimum volume condition on $B^{(k)}$, established just below (4.9).) Thus

$$Q_{xy}^{(k)} \leq (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{1+c_2k^2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq 4L_k\}}. \quad (4.28)$$

We will also be interested in $R_{xy}^{(k)}$, defined as the probability that x, y lie in the same small block $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ on any scale $i \leq k$. This is a sum of $Q_{xy}^{(i)}$ over i such that $|x - y| \leq 4L_i \leq 4L_k$. It should be clear that

$$R_{xy}^{(k)} \leq (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{1+c_3(\log(|x-y|/4V_1))^2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x-y| \leq 4L_k\}}, \quad (4.29)$$

and so we obtain a rate of decay uniform in k for the probability that x, y belong to the same small block. The probability decays faster than any power of $|x - y|$. This is the rate of decay that governs our estimates on averaged correlations. Statements regarding exponential decay of correlations with probability 1 depend on the low density of blocks at each scale, decreasing with k so that $|x - y|^{(k)}$ remains comparable with $|x - y|$. The situation parallels that of [25], which established exponential decay with probability 1 in the one-body context.

4.3 Perturbation Step and Proof of Inductive Bounds

As in section 3.2, we write

$$J^{(j')} = J^{(j')\text{per}} + J^{(j')\text{res}}, \quad (4.30)$$

with

$$J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')\text{per}} = \sum_{g_{j'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}, L_{k-1} \leq |g_{j'}| < L_k, g_{j'} \cap \mathcal{S}_k = \emptyset, \sigma \neq \tilde{\sigma}} J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}(g_{j'}) \quad (4.31)$$

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)} = \sum_{g_{j'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j'}) = \sum_{g_{j'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} \frac{J_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')\text{per}}(g_{j'})}{E_{\sigma}^{(j')} - E_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{(j')}}. \quad (4.32)$$

As before, we resum terms with long graphs with $|g_{j'}| > \frac{8}{7}|I(g_{j'})|$. Let $g_{j''}$ denote either a short graph or a jump step representing all the resummed terms. Then put

$$A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''}) = \begin{cases} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j'}), & \text{if } g_{j''} = g_{j'}, \text{ a short graph,} \\ \sum_{\text{long } g_{j'}: \sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}} A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j'}), & \text{if } g_{j''} \text{ is long.} \end{cases} \quad (4.33)$$

With $\Omega^{(k)} = \exp(-A^{(k)})$, we define $H^{(k)} = \Omega^{(k)\text{tr}} H^{(j')\text{per}} \Omega^{(k)}$ and then as in (3.13) we can write

$$H^{(k)} = H_0^{(j')} + J^{(j')\text{res}} + J^{(j')\text{lint}} + J^{(k)}, \quad (4.34)$$

with

$$J^{(k)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{(n+1)!} (\text{ad} A^{(k)})^n J^{(j')\text{per}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad} A^{(k)})^n}{n!} J^{(j')\text{res}}. \quad (4.35)$$

Let us prove the inductive bounds (4.2), (4.6) for $k = j + 1$. For short graphs, we have

$$|A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j'})| \leq (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{j'}|}/(g_{j'}!)^{1/2}, \quad (4.36)$$

by the resonant condition (4.8II). For long graphs, we bound numerator and denominator separately in (4.32). The inductive bound (4.6) applies to the numerator, and the resonant condition (4.8I) bounds the denominator from below. After summing over the long graphs that contribute to $g_{j''}$, we have

$$A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''}) \leq (c\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{8}{7}|I(g_{j''})| \vee L_{k-1}}, \quad (4.37)$$

because all long graphs have $|g_{j'}| \geq \frac{8}{7}|I(g_{j'})| \vee L_{k-1} = \frac{8}{7}|g_{j''}|$, see definition (4.4). Recall that $\gamma \leq \varepsilon^{20}$, so $c^{8/7}\gamma^{1/7}\varepsilon^{-16/7} \leq 1$, and we obtain

$$|A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})| \leq \gamma^{|g_{j''}|}, \quad (4.38)$$

which completes the induction for $A^{(k)}$. (Since (4.38) is a stronger estimate, we actually have $|A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})| \leq (\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_{j''}|}/(g_{j''}!)^{1/2}$ for all $g_{j''}$ —recall that $g_{j''}!$ is defined without any factorials from jump steps.)

Let us now consider bounds on $J^{(k)}$, while at the same time giving details on how $J^{(k)}$ is expressed as a sum of graphs. By (4.35), $J^{(k)}$ is a sum of terms involving one or more commutators of $J^{(j')}$ with $A^{(k)}$. The simplest situation is when there is no gap between $g_{j''}$ and $g_{(j-1)'}$ in $[A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''}), J_{\tau\bar{\tau}}^{(j')}(g_{(j-1)'})]$. Here we need to be careful about what we mean by a gap. For any block $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ involved in either graph, we use the fattened version $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$, defined as $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ plus a collar of width $\frac{15}{14}L_{i-1}$. Then we specify that gaps do not include any sites in any of the $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ involved in the graphs on either side. Obtaining decay in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ is problematical, because of the dependence of the block energies of $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ on variables in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)} \setminus \bar{b}^{(i)}$. But we deal with the wider collars by contracting blocks $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(i)}$ to points when defining the metric $|\cdot|^{(i)}$. With this definition in mind, consider the case with no gap. Then $g_{j''}$ and $g_{(j-1)'}$ are combined in the new graph g_k for $J^{(k)}$, and we may bound the terms of the commutator separately, using (4.2), (4.6). This leads to an estimate

$$|J_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_k)| \leq \gamma(\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|g_k|-1}/(g_k!)^{1/2}, \quad (4.39)$$

which matches up with (4.6).

If there is a gap between $g_{j''}$ and the graph generated by $J^{(j')}$ or by previous commutators with $J^{(j')}$, then we need to exploit cancellation between terms to obtain decay in the gap. Let us consider the case of a single commutator $[A_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''}), J_{\tau\bar{\tau}}^{(j')}(g_{(j-1)'})]$. The two terms AJ and JA differ in that energy denominators in A are computed two

ways, that is, before and after the transition $\tau \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}$. Likewise, the energy denominators in J are computed before and after the transition $\sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\sigma}$. But let us focus on the effect the transition $\tau \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}$ has on A . The energies in A 's denominators are $E_{\nu}^{(i')}$ for various spin configurations ν and scales $0 \leq i \leq j$. Differences $D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')} = E_{\nu}^{(i')} - E_{\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}$ have a graphical expansion, see (4.14). The expansion exhibits the nonlocal dependence on the spin configuration. For each denominator in $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})$, we write

$$\frac{1}{D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tau)} - \frac{1}{D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tilde{\tau})} = \frac{D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tilde{\tau}) - D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tau)}{D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tau)D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tilde{\tau})}, \quad (4.40)$$

where the dependence on τ or $\tilde{\tau}$ is written explicitly. The commutator can be written as a sum of terms switching each denominator in turn from τ to $\tilde{\tau}$ using (4.40). In the numerator we write

$$D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tilde{\tau}) - D_{\nu\tilde{\nu}}^{(i')}(\tau) = \sum_{m=1}^{i-1} \sum_{g_{m'}} \delta_{\tau\tilde{\tau}} J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(m')}(g_{m'}), \quad (4.41)$$

where $\delta_{\tau\tilde{\tau}}$ takes the difference between values at τ and $\tilde{\tau}$. As in the discussion following (4.14), we repeat the process by applying (4.40) to the denominators of $J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(m')}(g_{m'})$. We are doing a discrete version of the chain rule of Subsection 4.2.2 to probe the dependence on τ . (Here, however, we use fattened blocks $\bar{b}^{(i)}$, so we do not need to worry about dependence of block energies on τ ; we are investigating only their perturbative corrections.) The process can stop for any term whose chain of graphs crosses the gap between $g_{j''}$ and $g_{(j-1)'}$. As in Subsection 4.2.2, each jump step of $g_{j''}$ is written as the sum of its constituent graphs, see (4.33). This is necessary so that we may probe the dependence on τ everywhere it occurs. Each step of the process lowers the scale index on the denominators by one or more. At some point, the graphs must span the gap since otherwise the last δJ would vanish—the energies $E^{(1')}$ depend only on τ one step away.

There is a limit to the range of dependence of energies on τ . Energies $E^{(j')}$ appear in $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})$. They are diagonal entries $J_{\sigma\sigma}^{(m')}(g_{m'})$ for $m < j$, so their order is $< L_{m+1}$. This means the range is $< \frac{1}{2}L_{m+1}$, since $g_{m'}$ has to double back to undo any flips performed in its first half. The greatest possible total range is for a sequence $g_{(j-1)'}, g_{(j-2)'}, \dots, g_{1'}$, leading to a maximum range of $\frac{1}{2}(L_j + L_{j-1} + \dots) = \frac{1}{2}L_j(1 + \frac{8}{15} + \dots) \leq \frac{15}{14}L_j$. As mentioned earlier, this bound is important because it limits the number of spin configurations for which we need to control resonance probabilities. An exponential number of configurations is controlled by exponentially small resonance probabilities.

The double-back nature of the energy graphs implies that their graph length $|g_{i'}|$ is at least twice the length of the intervals spanned, $I(g_{i'})$. Hence they all become jump steps $g_{i''}$ with an improved rate of decay $\sim \gamma^{|g_{i''}|}$ as in (4.2), instead of $(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{|g_{i'}|}$. There

is an important caveat, however: the first doubled denominator from the chain rule may be greater in span than the size of the energy graphs generated. This would happen if the gap between $g_{j''}$ and $g_{(j-1)'}$ is smaller than L_j . (Subsequent double denominators are internal to g and they may be bounded using (4.8I), leading to the $(\gamma/\varepsilon^2)^{|g|}$ bound.) See Figure 2.




Figure 2: Energy graph g is double the length of the gap between $g_{j''}$ and $g_{(j-1)'}$. A denominator in $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})$ is doubled because the commutator creates a difference, which is reexpressed using (4.40).

The first double denominator has to be treated probabilistically (Markov inequality) along with all the other non-jump step denominators in $A_{\sigma\tilde{\sigma}}^{(k)}(g_{j''})$. Otherwise the extra ε^{-1} factors—potentially as many as $|g_{j''}|$ —would lead to non-uniformity of the decay estimates with k . Further details on this will be given below.

If we are working with multi-commutators from $(\text{ad}A^{(k)})^n$ applied to $J^{(j')}$, a similar analysis shows that decay at rate γ can be obtained for all gaps. But now that we are dealing with graphs with doubled denominators, it could happen that in a later step a doubled denominator gets differenced again as in (4.40). We need to cap the multiplicity of denominators at 3, because unlimited powers would force the fractional moment exponent s to zero. We allow a denominator to be differenced to close a gap to the left and to the right. But if a second difference is performed on the same side, we undo the earlier, closer difference on that side by reversing (4.40), returning to the original expression as two terms with no doubled denominator. The point being that decay across both gaps will derive from the outer difference operator and expansion; there is no longer any need to expand out the inner difference. It may be necessary to perform the reversal operation on denominators that were doubled or tripled at earlier steps; the same principle applies. We go further by limiting the number of differenced denominators at this scale to two in each subgraph $g_{j''}$ or $g_{(j-1)'}$; if two connections occur on the same side, one can be reversed without losing connectivity. With this limitation, we can easily see that denominator sums are controlled by factors $c^{|g|}$. These can be absorbed into other combinatoric factors of the same form—see Subsection 4.2.1. The net result is a graphical expansion for $(\text{ad}A^{(k)})^n J^{(j')}$ as a sum

of graphs g_k involving the usual subgraphs $g_{j'}$ plus a collection of jump step graphs $g_{i''}$ with $i < j$ that connects them all together. We organize the graph by assigning to gap graphs all the energy graphs from (4.41) that were generated in the process of bridging the gaps. The doubled denominators themselves remain with the main portion of g_k , unless they were already in a jump step. The graphs assigned to gap steps can be summed up, and as explained above, we obtain decay at rate γ across gaps and for jump steps, and at rate γ/ε elsewhere. We obtain the required bound (4.39), now with an understanding that g_k includes the additional gap graphs as subgraphs. As with the other jump steps, gap graphs are “spectator” graphs—replaced with uniform bounds—in the Markov inequality. Note that the “active” denominators do not depend on the “spectator” parts of the graph as they see only the initial and final configuration of the jump.

The bound just proven for $J^{(k)}$ will lead to the corresponding bound (4.6) for $J^{(k')}$ after the block rotations are performed. Note that by (4.4), the size of a graph $g_{j''}$ in an $A^{(k)}$ term is $\frac{7}{8}L_{k-1}$. The minimum size of a $J^{(j')}$ graph is L_{k-1} . Combining these, we obtain a minimum size of $\frac{15}{8}L_{k-1} = L_k$ for graphs g_k . This has been assumed throughout, so it needs to be verified as part of our inductive assumptions.

We return to the issue of the doubled or tripled denominators, and their effect on the Markov inequality. The main difference is that (4.21) requires $s < 1/3$ if we want $\mathbb{E}(\Delta E)^{-3s}$ to be finite. So let us take $s = 1/4$. This of course reduces the rate of decay of probabilities in (4.22), (4.23), but does not alter any of our conclusions. Also, it is somewhat inconvenient having the two denominators $D_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^{(\tau)}$ and $D_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^{(\bar{\tau})}$ in (4.40). So we use Schwartz or a Hölder inequality to bound the expectation of doubled or tripled denominators by a geometric mean of expectations where multiple denominators are actually 2nd or 3rd powers. Thus it will be sufficient to prove bounds on expectations where the denominators have that structure. This is helpful because the Jacobian bound of Subsection 4.2.2 can then be used to estimate the moments of the denominators as before.

4.4 Diagonalization and Conclusion of Proof

We reorganize terms as in Section 3.3:

$$J^{(j')\text{res}} + J^{(j)\text{lint}} + J^{(k)} = J^{(k)\text{ext}} + J^{(k)\text{sint}} + J^{(k)\text{lint}}. \quad (4.42)$$

Terms whose graph intersects s_k and is contained in $\bar{s}_k$ are put in $J^{(k)\text{sint}}$ (small block terms) or $J^{(k)\text{lint}}$ (large block terms). Diagonal terms of order less than L_k are included in $J^{(k)\text{sint}}$. This ensures that in the next step, all interactions will be of order at least L_k .

Let $O^{(k)}$ be the matrix that diagonalizes small blocks, so that

$$H_0^{(k')} = O^{(k)\text{tr}}(H_0^{(j')} + J^{(k)\text{sint}})O^{(k)} \quad (4.43)$$

is diagonal. Then put

$$H^{(k')} = O^{(k)\text{tr}} H^{(k)} O^{(k)} = H_0^{(k')} + J^{(k')} + J^{(k)\text{lint}}. \quad (4.44)$$

Here $J^{(k')}$ is the rotated version of $J^{(k)\text{ext}}$. It has a graphical expansion with bounds as in (4.5), (4.6), as proven in the last section. Graphs $g_{k'}$ include matrix elements of $O^{(k)}, O^{(k)\text{tr}}$, as appropriate.

Define the cumulative rotation

$$R^{(k')} = R^{(j')}\Omega^{(k)}O^{(k)}. \quad (4.45)$$

Then as in earlier steps we prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha \left| \sum_{\sigma\bar{\sigma}} R_{\alpha\sigma}^{(k')\text{tr}} S_0^z R_{\bar{\sigma}\alpha} \right| = 1 + O(\varepsilon^s). \quad (4.46)$$

The probability that 0 is in a small block is less than $c\rho_1\varepsilon^s$, by (4.29). The rotation of S_0^z generates a graphical expansion much like the one for the rotation of H . The leading term is ± 1 and the corrections are $O(\gamma/\varepsilon)$ —see (2.20) and the discussion after.

Let us consider the behavior of truncated expectations $\langle \mathcal{O}_x; \mathcal{O}_y \rangle_\alpha^{(k)}$. Cancellation of graphs forces graphs to span the distance from i to j . Graphs do not penetrate large blocks, and there is no rotation in large blocks, therefore $\langle \mathcal{O}_x; \mathcal{O}_y \rangle_\alpha^{(k)}$ vanishes if any large block intervenes between i and j . Suppose that $|x - y|/8 \in [L_{m-1}, L_m]$. Then as in the discussion following (4.11), no more than $\frac{1}{2}$ the distance from x to y could be covered by blocks $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ with $j < m$. The probability that a larger scale block covers part of the segment from x to y is bounded by $(c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{1+\tilde{c}_2m^2}$, by (4.28). Hence we have an estimate:

$$|\langle \mathcal{O}_x; \mathcal{O}_y \rangle_\alpha^{(k)}| \leq (c\gamma/\varepsilon)^{|x-y|/2}, \text{ with probability } 1 - (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{1+c_3(\log(|x-y|/8\vee 1))^2}. \quad (4.47)$$

Of course, in step k there are no blocks on scales $> k$, so we would actually have exponential decay for $\langle \mathcal{O}_x; \mathcal{O}_y \rangle_\alpha^{(k)}$ with probability 1 for $|x - y| > 8L_{k+1}$. But (4.30) gives a bound that is valid for all x, y, k so it carries over to the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$. (The limit will be discussed below.) We obtain exponential decay except on a set whose probability decays rapidly with the distance. Averaged correlations are dominated by the probabilities of rare events (*i.e.* blocks). Thus

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Av}_\alpha |\langle \mathcal{O}_x; \mathcal{O}_y \rangle_\alpha^{(k)}| \leq (c\rho_1\varepsilon^s)^{1+c_3(\log(|x-y|/8\vee 1))^2}, \quad (4.48)$$

which decays faster than any power of $|x - y|$, but not exponentially.

If we let the procedure run to $k = \infty$, off-diagonal matrix elements vanish in the limit. Then the eigenvalues of the starting Hamiltonian are given by the diagonal elements of $H_0^\infty \equiv \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_0^{(k')}$. The eigenfunctions are given by the columns of $R^{(\infty)} \equiv \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} R^{(k')}$. Block formation has to stop eventually in a finite volume Λ , by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, because by (4.28) their probabilities are summable. After that, all the matrices involved converge rapidly. The bounds (4.46)-(4.48) remain true in the limit, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 under assumption **A1**.

4.5 Infinite Volume Limit and Local State-Labeling Operators

We show that eigenvalue differences and local expectations converge in the $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit, with probability one. The eigenstates are labeled by spin/metaspin configurations α for each finite volume Λ . Away from resonant blocks, there is a one-to-one correspondence between an ordinary spin configuration and the state label α . As (4.46) shows, S^z expectations are close to the labeling configuration values, so in that sense eigenstates resemble the $\gamma = 0$ eigenstates, which are concentrated on the labeling spin configuration. This is analogous to the concentration of eigenfunctions near individual sites in the one-body Anderson model at high disorder. Of course, resonant blocks interfere with this naïve labeling scheme, because of mixing and entanglement of the unperturbed states in the block. In a block, labels are assigned when the diagonalization step is performed there. This involves a finite-dimensional matrix that has unique eigenvalues with probability one. (The discriminant can not vanish on a set of positive measure without being identically zero, and as we explained earlier one can find parameter values where it is non zero.) Therefore, except for a set of measure zero, one can label block states in order of increasing energy. We have been calling the block states “metaspins” because like ordinary spin variables, they label the local state in the block. A block of size n has 2^n metaspin values, and so they can be put into one-to-one correspondence with ordinary spin configurations in the block. Our constructions and estimates show that local expectations are determined up to errors of order $(\gamma/\varepsilon)^\ell$ by the spin/metaspin configuration out to a distance ℓ in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

The abovementioned properties are equivalent to the existence of an extensive set of local operators that commute with the Hamiltonian [41, 31]. We may construct such operators as follows. Working in the basis we have constructed, in which H is diagonal, define an operator that assigns the spin/metaspin value to each eigenstate possessing that label. Such operators are diagonal in this basis, as is the Hamiltonian. So after returning to the original basis we obtain operators that commute with H and that are local (because $R^{(\infty)}$ is given by a convergent product of local rotations).

Our procedure produces convergent expressions for the eigenvalues in a box Λ . However, if we wish to investigate their behavior in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we should work with eigenvalue differences corresponding to states whose labeling configurations α, β differ only locally in a fixed region $\mathcal{R}$. As discussed in Subsection 4.2.2, eigenvalue differences have graphical expansions with exponential decay localized to $\mathcal{R}$ —see (4.6), (4.14). Graphs generated in step k depend on the random couplings only in a neighborhood of width $O(L_k)$ about the graph (dependence arises because of denominator energies). Expectations of observables localized in $\mathcal{R}$ likewise have local graphical expansions. These expansions can be used to demonstrate convergence of eigenvalue differences and expectations as Λ increases to $\mathbb{Z}$ through a sequence of intervals $[-K, K]$.

When investigating convergence as $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, it is convenient to use a Λ -independent construction of resonant blocks. We consider a graph $\bar{g}$ to be resonant even if some or all of it lies outside Λ . Even if some of the transitions of $\bar{g}$ are not allowed because they

take place outside Λ , the event that $\bar{g}$ is resonant can still be defined by enlarging Λ as needed. The usual probability bounds will remain valid. Recall that we sum over every background spin configuration in a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\bar{g}$ so as to catch every possible resonance. Some energies may depend on how Λ is situated with respect to $\mathcal{N}$, so we need to further sum over all the ways that Λ could intersect $\mathcal{N}$. There are no more than $\text{diam}(\mathcal{N})$ possibilities, so this sum can easily be handled along with the background spin sum. With this setup, one can see that the probability bound (4.28) implies that every site has a maximum scale k at which a block $b^{(k)}$ forms within a distance $10L_k$ (by Borel-Cantelli).

Now consider how increasing the volume from Λ_1 to Λ_2 affects an expectation or a local energy difference. The difference involves a sum of graphs that reach from $\mathcal{R}$ to $\partial\Lambda_1$, so it will be exponentially small in $\text{dist}(\mathcal{R}, \partial\Lambda_1)$, provided $\text{dist}(\mathcal{R}, \partial\Lambda_1) \geq 10L_k$. As Λ_1 increases, $\text{dist}(\mathcal{R}, \partial\Lambda_1)$ will eventually exceed $10L_k$, at which point exponential convergence takes over. In this way, we obtain almost sure convergence of local quantities in the $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ limit.

5 Level Statistics

At this point, we have proven many-body localization (MBL) under assumption **A1**, which states that energy differences move to first order with the randomness—see (4.13). Here we use MBL as a short hand for all of our conclusions, including

- (i) Existence of a labeling system for eigenstates by spin/metaspin configurations, with metaspins needed only on a dilute collection of resonant blocks.
- (ii) Bounds on the probability of resonant blocks, (4.24), (4.28), (4.29), which establish their diluteness.
- (iii) Diagonalization of H via a sequence of local rotations defined via convergent graphical expansions with bounds as in (4.2).
- (iv) Bounds establishing closeness of expectations of local observables in any eigenstate to their naïve ($\gamma = 0$) values, when observables are not in resonant blocks. These lead to statements like (4.46), which show that most states resemble the $\gamma = 0$ states locally.
- (v) Almost sure convergence of local energy differences and expectations of local observables as $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.
- (vi) Exponential decay of truncated expectations, except on a set of rapidly decaying probability, see (4.47).
- (vii) Faster-than-power-law decay of averaged truncated expectations as in (4.48).

We expect **A1** to be true for the spin chain with all three terms random. Nevertheless, we would like to show how MBL can be obtained under weaker assumptions that are easier to interpret and that do not refer to properties of effective Hamiltonians. In effect, **A1** is a working hypothesis that we need in order to continue the induction, but the tools we have developed are flexible enough to prove **A1** with high probability as we go along. (If **A1** fails, we can define a new resonant block and check it again at a longer length scale.) Here is our fundamental assumption on level statistics. It depends on parameters ν, ε :

Assumption A2(ν, ε). (*Unlikeliness of small eigenvalue differences*) Consider the Hamiltonian H in boxes of size of n . Its eigenvalues satisfy

$$P\left(\min_{\alpha \neq \beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta| < \varepsilon^n\right) \leq \varepsilon^{\nu n}, \quad (5.1)$$

for all n .

The exponential decay of probability with n is actually not needed—we could make do with probability decay similar to (4.29), since that is what is used to control the diluteness of resonant blocks. But let us work with **A2**(ν, ε) for simplicity.

Theorem 5.1. Fix some $\nu > 0$. There is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that if **A2**(ν, ε) holds for some $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ then MBL holds for $\gamma \leq \varepsilon^{20}$.

Before proving this, let us show how **A2**(ν, ε) follows from the more standard statement on level statistics that appears on the introduction:

Assumption LLA(ν, c). (*Limited level attraction*) Consider the Hamiltonian H in size boxes of n . Its eigenvalues satisfy

$$P\left(\min_{\alpha \neq \beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta| < \delta\right) \leq \delta^\nu c^n, \quad (5.2)$$

for all $\delta > 0$ and all n .

Clearly, we may take $\delta = \varepsilon^n$ in (5.2) and then **A2**(ν', ε) holds for any $\nu' < \nu$, provided ε is small enough. Thus we have

Corollary 5.2. Assume **LLA**(ν, c) for some fixed ν, c . Then MBL holds for γ small enough.

As explained earlier, we can handle level statistics that are neutral (like Poisson, $\nu = 1$), or repulsive ($\nu > 1$ as for GOE), and we can handle values of ν smaller than 1, which correspond to level attraction. Thus we obtain MBL, provided there is a bound uniform in n on the level attraction exponent ν . Note that, speaking broadly, level

statistics are expected to be repulsive or neutral. However, we are not aware of any general result of that type.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We need to verify **A1** on a set of sufficiently high probability. The idea is to compare the energy levels of $H_0^{(j-1)'} + J^{(j)\text{sint}}$ in $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ with those of $\bar{H}$ in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)} \cap \Lambda$. (Recall that $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$ is $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ plus an additional collar of width $\frac{15}{14}L_{j-1}$, measured as usual in the metric $|\cdot|^{(j-1)}$.) This allows for the maximum range of dependence in the $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ eigenvalues (through energies $E_\sigma^{(j-1)'}$ in $H^{(j-1)'}$). Here $\bar{H}$ is the original Hamiltonian restricted to $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$, which means that spins outside of $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$ fixed at $+1$. As explained in Section 4.5, we may define resonant graphs and blocks by including every possible configuration of spins and of Λ within the relevant range. Therefore, the set of resonant blocks $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ does not depend on the volume Λ (or on the fixing of spin variables outside Λ).

Let us assume that in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$, the eigenvalues of $\bar{H}$ satisfy

$$\min_{\alpha \neq \beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta| \geq \varepsilon^{s\kappa n}, \quad (5.3)$$

where n is the number of sites in $\bar{b}^{(j)}$, and κ is a small constant to be chosen below. Note that the size of $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$ is no greater than some multiple m of n , after allowing for the expansion of distance due to blocks at lower scales. So if we let $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{s\kappa/m}$, then **A2**($\tilde{\varepsilon}, \nu$) implies that (5.3) occurs with probability at least $1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^{\nu mn} = 1 - \varepsilon^{s\nu\kappa n}$. We will discuss below the case where (5.3) does not hold.

We may perform all our expansions on $\bar{H}$ in $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)} \cap \Lambda$. We obtain block energies $\bar{\bar{E}}_\alpha^{(j')}$. These agree with the corresponding energies $E_\alpha^{(j')}$ obtained from the expansion in Λ , because as explained earlier, the range of dependence on σ is less than the width of the collar $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)} \setminus \bar{b}^{(j)}$. Furthermore, all remaining terms in $\bar{H}^{(j')}$ (the Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$ after the j^{th} step) are of order L_{j+1} , so by (4.6) they are exponentially small—in total no greater in norm than $(c\gamma/\varepsilon)^{n/4}$. (Note that separation conditions keep other blocks $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ or $\bar{B}^{(j')}$ out of $\bar{\bar{b}}^{(j)}$. The size of $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ is no greater than $4L_j$, from the collar of width L_j about $b^{(j)}$, plus some additional expansion from smaller blocks.) Thus the minimum eigenvalue spacing in (5.3) transfers to $\bar{\bar{E}}_\alpha^{(j')}$ and hence to $E_\alpha^{(j')}$. (Since $\gamma \leq \varepsilon^{20}$, the corrections are much smaller than the minimum gap.) At the heart of our method is a way to extract local “quasimode” energies for transitions approximated on a length scale L , with errors exponential in L . Rotations were performed for graphs connecting $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ to its complement, up to scale L_j , so any residual effects are exponentially small.

In order to obtain assumption **A1** we need to compare derivatives of $\bar{\bar{E}}_\alpha^{(j')}$ with those of $\bar{E}_\alpha$. Since we are making a perturbation with exponentially small norm and derivatives, bounds on derivatives of $\bar{E}_\alpha$ carry over to those of $E_\alpha^{(j')} = \bar{\bar{E}}_\alpha^{(j')}$ via second order perturbation theory. There will be a sum over intermediate states (no more than exponential in n) and an energy denominator (bounded below by (5.3)). Thus derivatives of $E_\alpha^{(j')}$ (or more precisely of differences $E_\alpha^{(j')} - E_\beta^{(j')}$) agree with those of $\bar{\bar{E}}_\alpha$ up to errors of order $(c\gamma/\varepsilon^{1+s\kappa})^n$.

Next we use (5.3) to prove a lower bound on the radial derivative of $\bar{E}_\alpha - \bar{E}_\beta$. Note that the radial variable r appears as a multiplicative factor in $\bar{H}$, since all couplings h_i, J_i, γ_i are proportional to r . Therefore energies (and their differences) are strictly proportional to r . Let us fix the angular variables. Then there is some r_0 such that the minimum eigenvalue separation is $\varepsilon^{s\kappa n}$. Any eigenvalue difference can be written as

$$E_\alpha(r) - E_\beta(r) \equiv D_{\alpha\beta}(r) = D_{\alpha\beta}(r_0) \frac{r}{r_0}. \quad (5.4)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} D_{\alpha\beta}(r) = \frac{D_{\alpha\beta}(r_0)}{r_0} \geq \frac{\varepsilon^{s\kappa n}}{\sqrt{3mn}}, \quad (5.5)$$

where we use the radius of the integration domain $[-1, 1]^{mn}$ to bound r_0 from above. Thus we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(E_\alpha^{(j')}(r) - E_\beta^{(j')}(r) \right) \right|^{-1} \leq (c\varepsilon^{-s\kappa})^n, \quad (5.6)$$

since as explained above, the derivatives of $E_\alpha^{(j')}$ agree with these of E_α up to terms much smaller than $\varepsilon^{s\kappa n}$.

Note that (5.6) compares with (4.12) of assumption **A1**, with $c_b = c\varepsilon^{-s\kappa}$. Each time we do a denominator integral in proving an estimate like (4.23), we pick up a factor of c_b , which through (4.12) controls the rate of change of energy differences. So now that $c_b = c\varepsilon^{-s\kappa}$, we need to absorb factors of $\varepsilon^{-s\kappa}$ into (4.23). Each denominator integral yields a factor $\varepsilon^{s/4}$ in (4.23), and so a factor of $\varepsilon^{-s\kappa}$ can be handled with a reduction of the power from $s/4$ to $s/8$, for some small value of κ . There are also factors c_b^n for blocks of size n . Again, these can be absorbed with the reduction in power from $s/4$ to $s/8$ because the graph size $|g_{j'}|$ is always comparable in size (or longer than) the sum of its block sizes. Thus our estimates work with only this minor modification.

It remains for us to discuss the case where (5.2) does not hold, an event whose probability is no greater than $\varepsilon^{s\nu\kappa n}$. We may consider any block $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ with a too-small level spacing as part of $\mathcal{S}_k$, the next singular region. Its probability is exponentially small in the size of $\bar{b}^{(j)}$, so we obtain a bound similar to (4.24):

$$P_{xy}^{(k)} \leq c\varepsilon^{s\nu\kappa|x-y|}. \quad (5.7)$$

The rate of decay is $\varepsilon^{s\nu\kappa}$ instead of ε^s , but as long as ε is chosen sufficiently small, the proof of diluteness of resonant blocks works as before. Diluteness is the bound (4.29) giving rapid falloff of the probability that x, y belong to the same resonant block. The proof relies on bounds like (4.24), which provide a probability factor ε^s for each site of $b^{(k)}$. Then separation conditions tied to the volume control the sum over admissible $b^{(k)}$ and provide a minimum volume for a given diameter. All this would work if we defined the volume of a block $\bar{b}^{(j)}$ of size n as $O((\log n)^2)$, the same as the minimum

volume achievable from sites of $\mathcal{S}_k$ via the original construction. This makes it clear that we could make do with a weaker form of **A2**(ε, ν), replacing (5.1) with

$$P\left(\min_{\alpha \neq \beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta| < \varepsilon^n\right) \leq \varepsilon^{\nu(1+c_4(\log n)^2)}, \quad (5.8)$$

for some constant c_4 . (This could potentially be useful if in the future better methods are developed to control minimum level spacings.) The basic mechanism at play here is that by Borel-Cantelli, (5.8) guarantees that there is some scale k at which the minimum level spacing holds. When that happens, we obtain the needed variation of $E_\alpha^{(k')} - E_\beta^{(k')}$ with r , and the rest of the proof of MBL works as described in Chapter 4. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1. Corollary 5.2 then gives the full version of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Tom Spencer for a collaboration over several years, during which time many of the ideas were developed. Thanks also to David Huse, who suggested this problem, and was helpful in numerous conversations.

References

- [1] AIZENMAN, M., AND MOLCHANOV, S. Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies: an elementary derivation. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 157, (1993), 245–278.
- [2] AIZENMAN, M., AND WARZEL, S. Localization bounds for multiparticle systems. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 290, (2009), 903–934.
- [3] ANDERSON, P. Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices. *Phys. Rev.* 109, (1958), 1492–1505.
- [4] ANDERSON, P. Infrared catastrophe in Fermi gases with local scattering Potentials. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 18, (1967), 1049–1051.
- [5] BACH, V., FRÖHLICH, J., AND SIGAL, I. Renormalization group analysis of spectral problems in quantum field theory. *Adv. Math.* 137, (1998), 205–298.
- [6] BASKO, D., ALEINER, I., AND ALTSHULER, B. Metal-insulator transition in a weakly interacting many-electron system with localized single-particle states. *Ann. Phys.* 321, (2006), 1126–1205.
- [7] BELLISSARD, J., LIMA, R., AND SCOPPOLA, E. Localization in ν -dimensional incommensurate structures. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 88, (1983), 465–477.
- [8] BELLISSARD, J., LIMA, R., AND TESTARD, D. A metal-insulator transition for the almost Mathieu model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 234 (1983), 207–234.
- [9] BROCKETT, R. Dynamical systems that sort lists, diagonalize matrices, and solve linear programming problems. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 146 (1991), 79–91.
- [10] CHULAEVSKY, V. Direct scaling analysis of localization in disordered systems. II. Multi-particle lattice systems. arxiv:1106.2234.

- [11] CHULAEVSKY, V., DE MONVEL, A., AND SUHOV, Y. Dynamical localization for a multi-particle model with an alloy-type external random potential. *Nonlinearity* 24, (2011), 1451–1472.
- [12] CHULAEVSKY, V., AND DINABURG, E. Methods of KAM-theory for long-range quasi-periodic operators on $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. Pure point spectrum. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 153 (1993), 559–577.
- [13] CHULAEVSKY, V., AND SINAI, Y. The exponential localization and structure of the spectrum for 1D quasi-periodic discrete Schrödinger Operators. *Rev. Math. Phys.* 3, (1991), 241–284.
- [14] CHULAEVSKY, V., AND SUHOV, Y. Eigenfunctions in a two-particle Anderson tight binding model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 289, (2009), 701–723.
- [15] CHULAEVSKY, V., AND SUHOV, Y. Multi-particle Anderson localisation: Induction on the number of particles. *Math. Physics, Anal. Geom.* 12, (2009), 117–139.
- [16] DATTA, N., FERNÁNDEZ, R., AND FRÖHLICH, J. Low-temperature phase diagrams of quantum lattice systems. I. Stability for quantum perturbations of classical systems with finitely-many ground states. *J. Stat. Phys.* 84, (1996), 455–534.
- [17] DATTA, N., FERNÁNDEZ, R., AND FRÖHLICH, J. Effective Hamiltonians and phase diagrams for tight-binding models. *J. Stat. Phys.* 96, (1999), 545–611.
- [18] DE ROECK, W., AND HUVEENEERS, F. Asymptotic quantum many-body localization from thermal disorder. arxiv:1308.6263.
- [19] DEIFT, P., NANDA, T., AND TOMEI, C. Ordinary differential equations and the symmetric eigenvalue problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 20, (1983), 1–22.
- [20] DEUTSCH, J. Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system. *Phys. Rev. A* 43, (1991), 2046–2049.
- [21] ELIASSEN, L. Discrete one-dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators with pure point spectrum. *Acta Math.* 179, (1997), 153–196.
- [22] ELIASSEN, L. Perturbations of linear quasi-periodic system. In *Dynamical Systems and Small Divisors*. Springer, 2002, pp. 1–60.
- [23] FAUSER, M., AND WARZEL, S. Multiparticle localization for disordered systems on continuous space via the fractional moment method. arxiv:1402.5832.
- [24] FLEISHMAN, L., AND ANDERSON, P. Interactions and the Anderson transition. *Phys. Rev. B* 21, (1980), 2366–2377.
- [25] FRÖHLICH, J., AND SPENCER, T. Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 88, (1983), 151–184.
- [26] GIAMARCHI, T., AND SCHULZ, H. Localization and interaction in one-dimensional quantum fluids. *Europhys. Lett.* 3, (1987), 1287–1293.
- [27] GISCARD, P., CHOO, Z., MITCHISON, M., MENDOZA-ARENAS, J., AND JAKSCH, D. An explicit bound for dynamical localisation in an interacting many-body system. arxiv:1402.1421.
- [28] GLĄZEK, S., AND WILSON, K. Renormalization of Hamiltonians. *Phys. Rev. D* 48, (1993), 5863–5872.
- [29] GORNYI, I., MIRLIN, A., AND POLYAKOV, D. Interacting electrons in disordered wires: Anderson localization and low-T transport. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95, (2005), 206603.
- [30] GROTE, I., KÖRDING, E., AND WEGNER, F. Stability analysis of the Hubbard model. *J. Low Temp. Phys.* 126, (2002), 1385–1409.

- [31] HUSE, D., AND OGANESYAN, V. A phenomenology of certain many-body-localized systems. arxiv:1305.4915.
- [32] IMBRIE, J., AND SPENCER, T. Multiscale Jacobi method for Anderson localization. Unpublished.
- [33] KLEIN, A., AND NGUYEN, S. Bootstrap multiscale analysis and localization for multi-particle continuous Anderson Hamiltonians. arxiv:1311.4220.
- [34] KLEIN, A., AND NGUYEN, S. The bootstrap multiscale analysis for the multi-particle Anderson model. *J. Stat. Phys.* *151*, (2013), 938–973.
- [35] MIRLIN, A., AND FYODOROV, Y. Localization transition in the Anderson model on the Bethe lattice: Spontaneous symmetry breaking and correlation functions. *Nucl. Phys. B* *366*, (1991), 507–532.
- [36] OGANESYAN, V., AND HUSE, D. Localization of interacting fermions at high temperature. *Phys. Rev. B* *75*, (2007), 155111.
- [37] PAL, A., AND HUSE, D. Many-body localization phase transition. *Phys. Rev. B* *82*, (2010), 174411.
- [38] RIGOL, M., DUNJKO, V., AND OLSHANII, M. Thermalization and its mechanism for generic isolated quantum systems. *Nature* *452*, (2008), 854858.
- [39] SANTOS, L., RIGOLIN, G., AND ESCOBAR, C. Entanglement versus chaos in disordered spin chains. *Phys. Rev. A* *69*, (2004), 042304.
- [40] SCHRIEFFER, J., AND WOLFF, P. Relation between the Anderson and Kondo Hamiltonians. *Phys. Rev.* *149*, (1966), 491–492.
- [41] SERBYN, M., PAPIĆ, Z., AND ABANIN, D. A. Local conservation laws and the structure of the many-body localized states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* *111*, (2013), 127201.
- [42] SLEIJPEN, G., AND VAN DER VORST, H. A Jacobi–Davidson iteration method for linear eigenvalue problems. *SIAM Rev.* *42*, (2000), 267–293.
- [43] SREDNICKI, M. Chaos and quantum thermalization. *Phys. Rev. E* *50*, (1994), 888–901.
- [44] ŽNIDARIČ, M., PROSEN, T., AND PRELOVŠEK, P. Many-body localization in the Heisenberg XXZ magnet in a random field. *Phys. Rev. B* *77*, (2008), 064426.
- [45] WEGNER, F. Flow equations and normal ordering: a survey. *J. Phys. A. Math. Gen.* *39*, (2006), 8221–8230.
- [46] WHITE, S. Density matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* *69*, (1992), 2863–2866.